

# THE CLERGY REVIEW

WILLIAM ALLEN, 1532—1594

BY THE REV. J. L. WHITFIELD, M.A., D.S.O.

THOSE who drew up the "device for alteration of religion at the first year of Queen Elizabeth" were under no delusion as to their aim, nor had they any doubt as to the means by which it would be attained. The abolition of the Mass and the rejection of the Pope's spiritual supremacy would effectively cut off the nation from the unity of Christendom in both belief and polity. Both were enacted in Elizabeth's first parliament. At first it was necessary to proceed with caution, and the Oath of the Royal Supremacy was only required of persons of influence, and in practice not of all such, but the intention was that it should gradually embrace the whole people, as in fact the Act of Uniformity of Worship, with its enforced attendance at the Elizabethan service, did from the beginning. The motive was political—*cujus regio ejus religio*—and the penalties for non-compliance were those of civil offences, leading up in the case of repeated refusal of the Oath of Supremacy to death "as in the case of high treason."

William Allen was born while the edifice of the royal supremacy was first building, and grew to manhood amid the havoc of all that had gone before. Thus he was prepared to resist its resumption. At the time of Elizabeth's accession he was a fellow of Oriel College, Oxford—his statue may now be seen on the new front of the college—and Principal of St. Mary's Hall in that University. To avoid the Oath of Supremacy he vacated that position in 1560, and was able to retain his fellowship for another year. Then, rather than be false to his convictions, he bravely threw up his career,

quitted University and country, and went to Louvain with Christopher Blount as his pupil. There was gathering the flower of the English Church, "the most learned and most conscientious of the clergy," says Jessopp, "and of the most distinguished members of both Universities," striving from their exile to hold in check by the fruit of their learning and piety in private letters and published works the weeds of heresy that were being sown in their land. Allen was not to continue that work from a distance. A serious illness, brought on through attention to his sick pupil and unremitted study, placed his life in danger and he was told that only his native air could give hope of recovery. When he reached Lancashire, he was alarmed at the spirit of accommodation that was infecting the people. Men who held firmly to the Faith, and took every opportunity of hearing Mass, would also as occasion required be present at the Elizabethan services, with the plea that they were not free agents, and that whatever guilt there was lay on the Queen and the Parliament. It was the path by which the bulk of the nation eventually went into heresy, and that the people of Lancashire abandoned it has always been attributed to the zeal of William Allen. "Of all his life-long labours," it has been said, "this was perhaps the most notable and the most lasting in its effects." Still a layman, he went from one country house to another, wherever there was a gathering of Catholics, to instruct and reason about the iniquity of this compromise, to exhort and persuade them to avoid it. The results of his activity were too great to escape notice, and within two years it became necessary for his safety to quit Lancashire. For another year he continued the same work in Oxfordshire and then in Norfolk, until the circulation in manuscript of his "Brief Reasons concerning the Catholic Faith" gave rise to such active hostility that he was urged to leave England. He went to Mechlin, and there received all the orders; then as a priest, he devoted himself to teaching theology at a Benedictine convent in that city. While there he completed the first of his published works the "Defence of the Doctrine touching Purgatory" (May, 1565), and the "Defence of the Sacrament of Penance and of Indulgences" (1567), works which took him at a bound

into the front rank of skilled controversialists of that age.

The turning point of Allen's life was reached in the winter of 1567, and its occasion was a pilgrimage to Rome in the company of a fellow exile Morgan Philipps, who had been his tutor at Oxford, and Dr. John Vendeville, then regius professor of canon law in the University of Douay. Their object was devotion, but Vendeville had the further desire of an opportunity to lay before the Pope a project he had formed for the relief of Christian slaves out of Barbary and the conversion of the infidels. This was denied him, as they were unable to obtain an audience, although they spent the whole winter in Rome, and it was with a heavy heart that he set out on the return journey. On the way he gradually disclosed to Allen both his hopes and their disappointment, and Allen was given the opportunity to direct his attention to a whole nation in bondage for the faith under oppressors not less needing conversion. He had spoken to such purpose that Vendeville's despondency gave place to enthusiasm for the English cause, and the remainder of the journey was passed in planning how to serve it. Thus was Douay College conceived; it is certainly not entirely fanciful to think that as from Rome were sent the first Apostles to the English people, so from Rome also were sent those later missionaries to whose zeal it is due that the Catholic faith survived in the land in spite of persecution rivalled in severity and duration by that of the early Christian centuries alone.

A house was to be founded where Catholic exiles, who had already made some progress in theological studies, might receive the special training which the circumstances of the country demanded, "and then, after about two years of this instruction and training, work for the Catholic Faith in England even at the risk of their lives." Dr. Vendeville obtained aid from the Abbots of St. Vaast in Arras, of Anchin and of Marchiennes and from other charitable persons, and with the approval of the Chancellor of Douay University, Allen hired a large house near the theological schools, and began the work on Michaelmas Day, 1568. There were six students, of whom two were Flemings, since it was hoped that the new foundation would also

help to raise a zealous pastoral clergy for that province. But because of the scarcity of the commons, and knowing that they would fare better among their own countrymen, the Flemings soon left, and with them one of the exiles. Their places were immediately filled. Numbers grew rapidly, and Douay became the chief centre for the Catholics in exile. There were gathered, in addition to the theological students, young men of good family who were forced to seek abroad the Catholic education that was denied them at home; men who had accepted the State religion in England and in many cases ministered in it, came to be reconciled to the Church; others passing through Flanders on business came out of curiosity or friendly interest, stayed to their soul's profit, and went their way in the peace of God, "and they returning home glorified God for the things which they had seen, and persuaded many others to leave all and come to us at Douay." Letters of earnest remonstrance were sent at every opportunity to friends at home whom a faulty education had misled, urging them to forsake all for the Kingdom of God and promising them courteous entertainment when they came. And the "old priests" who were bearing the burden of the day in the faithful discharge of their office in England were welcomed for a period of rest and refreshment that they might be the better able to continue their noble work. All were received; those who were able contributed towards their own support, but none was rejected on the ground of penury; all who intended to receive holy orders could gain admittance at the common charge. Ten years after its foundation Allen was able to write to Vendeville: "Certainly, if nothing else had been effected, our labours and the contributions of others would not have been useless in the Lord, since from that time till now more than five hundred persons have at different times been instructed in religious knowledge in the college."

At the Easter of 1573, three and half years from its beginning, the college presented the first of its students, four in number, for ordination to the sacred priesthood. In succeeding years the numbers were six, then ten, next eleven, twenty-four in 1577 and twenty-two in the following year. Three priests trained at Douay were sent in 1574 to aid the "old priests" in fostering truth and combating heresy in England, and within six years the



number of these auxiliaries reached a hundred. The spirit with which they had been imbued has been described by a German Protestant historian: "More intimate knowledge of the mission priests teaches us to regard them as men of strong manly character, steadfast in their belief, and unruffled in their obedience—men whose self-control seldom failed them, and whose cheerfulness was seldom disturbed, who were transfigured by their victory over the world, and filled with love for all men without distinction—men, finally, who amidst the most terrible torments and ill-treatment remained free and unconquered, because to them martyrdom was the crown of life. . . . In no other European country at the time of the counter-reformation did the Catholic Church possess clergy who discharged their priestly duties with such a holy zeal as the little band that worked in England. 'The souls of Catholics are more precious than our bodies' might stand as the motto for the history of the mission" (Meyer: *England and the Catholic Church*. Eng. trans. p. 189).

"Of the Catholic priests who came to England in Elizabeth's reign," he tells us, "every second or third was put to death" (ib., p. 163). The first to suffer was Cuthbert Mayne on 29th November, 1577; of the twenty missionary priests for whom the title of Blessed was confirmed by Leo XIII all but one had been in Allen's college, and of the ninety-three priests, secular and religious, recently beatified, sixty-eight had at least some part of their training there.

Allen achieved this work by indomitable courage. The college was begun with no assured income, and depended entirely on the casual support which he and his friends could obtain. This was soon seriously diminished through the unrest in the Netherlands, and the difficulty in sending money out of England. Under these circumstances he petitioned Gregory XIII and at once received from him the grant of 100 gold crowns a month (April 15th, 1575.) Gregory Martin wrote the joyful news to Edmund Campion at Prague, and of the consequent "swarms of theological students and candidates for holy orders who were daily coming or rather flying to the college at the mere report of such magnificent liberality. It is a beautiful sight which I beheld when I was lately there. In that refectory where

in our time we sat down about six at one table, nearly sixty men and youths of the greatest promise were seated at three tables eating so pleasantly a little broth, thickened merely with the commonest roots, that you could have sworn that they were feasting on stewed raisins and prunes, English delicacies." Writing to Agazzari, January 15th, 1582, Allen tells that "Altogether there are about 130 under our care. Among all there are not more than sixteen who live at their own charges, or rather who were received on terms that they should live at their own expense; but they cannot fulfil the conditions, for this class we are in debt 500 crowns. That we may be able to support and give spiritual succour to a greater number, we must needs enforce a more frugal diet on every one. Reckoning up all in the way of rations, those who keep up the best style do not spend more than two crowns per head each month. There are thirty most excellent young men whom we must support at a crown a head each month; for they live on bread and broth, with butter and suchlike." Five years later he sought further aid from the Pope: there were 200 students and he could not support them all without additional help. The reply was that Allen should receive no more than the college income could support, if others applied they should be asked to wait for a vacancy. Allen replied that such was not his custom, nor could it be in future if he wished England to be saved. "This college should receive at once the sons of gentlemen especially, and others that have been deprived of their parents for the Catholic faith, or who have come hither against their parents' will. For they cannot wait till a vacancy occurs, seeing that they arrive stripped of every thing, often too with debts contracted on the journey, so that they cannot live a day without our aid, much less return home to the heretics through so many dangers. . . . If we had measured our undertaking by the means actually in hand, this seminary would never have come into being; for it was set up by poor men, who had no resources, and it existed for two entire years without any assured subsidy. . . . Further, if we had then so managed our affairs as to correspond with that Papal provision, of which alone we were certain, God would never have given the much greater support, which in His mercy He has since in different ways granted us."

To keep high-spirited young men, such as many necessarily were, contented and happy amid such difficulties and in the turbulent state of the world then obtaining, was Allen's success. "At an age so slippery, with such divers minds and characters, in a College so numerous, and human nature being so weak, it is evident that our labours must be many and great, and that we must have conflicts not a few." From a letter of Dr. Richard Barret to Agazzari we learn Allen's method of dealing with difficult subjects. He treated them with particular kindness, bore with them, and if they spoke in anger, "there is no remedy but patience. And so it comes about, since they are not egged on nor openly opposed, and what they say or do is not too carefully looked into, but is passed over in silence . . . that Allen retrains them in obedience" and is able to get good out of them. For men so divers in age and nurture no code of rules was possible or attempted. Dr. Worthington, who was a student in the early days, has recorded that "there was no need of any written law to keep the members in discipline. . . . If any question arose about anything, it was decided by the president, Allen, whose will was a law to all. He alone provided and distributed the temporalities. He alone prescribed the laws of study and piety. He taught his people by example, word of mouth, and in every way. Everyone depended on his will like sons, and that too most readily"; and Allen himself says: "A little government there is and order, but no bondage nor straitness in the world. There is neither oath nor statute, nor other bridle nor chastisement; but reason and every man's conscience in honest superiority and subalternation each one towards others."

Allen's influence sprang from his simple-mindedness. He lived for the cause. "The quarrel is God's; and but for His holy glory and honour I might sleep all safe and let the world wag and other men work." His own money and that which came to him from his professorship at Douay University, 200 gold crowns annually, he put unreservedly into the common fund; students whom he had formed for the work of the mission he gave up without a reproach when they wished to enter religion; when racial differences broke out in the English College at Rome, he risked ill-health to keep his own

college from infection by his constant presence among the students. His own character and its action on individual souls may be seen from the case of Ralph Shirley, a young man of good family, who had been sent to gain culture in Paris. His elder brother, a Catholic, had privately asked a friend there to interest himself in him, and by him he was put in touch with a highly-esteemed Jesuit. But their combined efforts had no effect in changing his views or weakening his prejudices. He happened to fall sick, and the friend took the opportunity to suggest a change, and that the air of Rheims would benefit him. Dr. Allen, who was forewarned, "called upon him on his arrival, and in the kindest and gentlest terms strove to persuade him to embrace the Catholic faith. He soon discovered that he was speaking to one who turned a deaf ear, and that his conversation on such topics was most unpalatable to the young convalescent. In deep affliction he said: 'If by doing penance for two or three years I could heal your soul of this heretical pestilence, I would willingly undertake it; but although my reasons have failed to convince you, I will daily recommend you to God, that He may free you from the dense darkness wherein you are involved, and enlighten your mind with the light of His grace.' " Shirley was impressed by his charity, but otherwise unmoved, and returning to Paris gave himself over to the pleasures of the city. But Allen's prayers were pursuing him with unhurrying chase and unperturbed pace, and to him also came the Voice: "Lo! naught contents thee, who content'st not Me." After his conversion Allen wrote: "Do not think, sweetest Ralph, either that the intercourse which lately took place between us has been to me in any way unpleasing, irksome or distasteful, or that I have been moved to any anger against you, even when your disease was most acute, as even then I clearly perceived the loveable character of your disposition. Certainly it was not with resentment against you, but with compassion, that my soul was deeply stirred; and, even when you vigorously combated my judgment and my warnings, still I eagerly desired your salvation, and I ceased not by prayer and sacrifice—that unique and most august rite of our religion—to commend most earnestly to Christ Jesus the cause of your soul, that was to me most dear. Yet to no mortal man so far, least of all

to yourself, have I thought that this should be revealed. That you did not then agree with us is assuredly no cause of surprise, for we attribute it to our sins; but in that shortly after you yielded to the Holy Spirit, that is to the Teacher of the Church, and to [grace] most powerfully persuading and most sweetly alluring, you are thrice happy, sweetest son, and I congratulate you from my heart on this the only highest and well-grounded good, and I pray that it may last for ever. And it will be fixed and lasting if from henceforth, in all the ordering of your life and studies, you aim at humility, are fervent in prayer, flee from sloth and contention, and always at the earliest occasion cleanse your conscience from all stain of erroneous views and moral transgressions in the Church's sacrament of penance. . . . And from henceforth in all your life and studies I would have you so use me as a helper and even as a Mæcnas, that you could not deal more familiarly or more gladly even with your own brother; for whereas formerly, even when you held wrong opinions in religion, I loved you for the sake of your family, your character, and your upbringing; now (by reason of our common faith in Christ and His Church, and the other highest gifts which at the same time have come to you from God), I cherish and embrace you with far greater affection. And if you love me also, as certainly you do, read as soon as may be, St. Augustine's Confessions," etc.

The growth of this Catholic England beyond the seas did not lack the attention of Elizabeth's government. The first response may be found in the Act of 1571 "against fugitives over the sea" which inflicted the penalty of loss of possessions on those who did not return within six months and submit themselves in all respects to the State religion. Allen became a marked man and if attempts to deprive him of life or liberty failed, something could be attempted to wreck his work. A treaty concluded with the States in rebellion against Philip of Spain on January 6th, 1577-8, contained the clause that "the States should not suffer any English rebels to be in the Low Countries, especially when the Queen should have declared them to be such." For more than a year the situation at Douay had been uneasy, and early in 1578 the revolutionary party prevailed. Allen had been absent since the previous July and was in



Rheims at the end of September; Dr. Bristow, who was in charge of the college, spent ten days there along with Dr. Bailey and Dr. Ely at the beginning of 1578. On March 22nd, the day before Palm Sunday, a proclamation commanded all the English to leave Douay before five o'clock on the following evening, save only old men and children, professors and women. The greater part of the students reached Rheims under Dr. Webb's guidance on the 27th, and the College remained for fifteen years in that city.

From this period Allen was increasingly associated with those who would employ foreign aid to save England for the Faith. Policy and religion were not then detached, as was clearly shewn in those of Elizabeth; and if religion might be made to serve policy, with far greater justification could policy be made to serve religion. Mary Stuart, the next heir to the throne, and by blood its legitimate claimant, was held prisoner in England. She was of the kindred of the Guises who were powerful at Rheims, and in her were centred the hopes of the English Catholics both at home and in exile. Whether at the time (1570) of Elizabeth's excommunication Allen was "not a little grieved at this manner of proceeding, and wish'd rather that it had been wholly left to the judgment of God," we have no direct evidence, but certainly when it had been promulgated he was prepared to implement it. "So long as the temporal state is no hindrance to eternal felicity and the glory of Christ's kingdom," he wrote in 1584, "the other intermeddleth not with her actions, but alloweth, defendeth, honoureth, and in particular commonwealths obeyeth the same. Yet when it is otherwise, and the temporal power resisteth God, or hindereth the proceeding of the people to salvation, there the spiritual hath the right to correct the temporal, and to procure by all means possible that the terrene kingdom give no annoyance to the state of the Church." And further: "But when in process of time some princes, through God's just judgment and the people's sin, were fallen into such contempt of religion (as it lightly happeneth by heresy and apostacy) that excommunication, being only a spiritual penalty, or other ordinary ecclesiastical discipline would not serve, then as well bishops as other godly persons, their own subjects, did crave aid and



arms of other princes for their chastisement, . . . that those whom the spiritual rod could not fruitfully chastise, they might by extern or temporal force bring to order and repentance, or at least defend their innocent Catholic subjects from unjust vexation." So long as Mary Stuart was alive, her cause could be considered the national cause, and after her death those abroad who had looked to Philip of Spain to serve it, kept their hopes fixed upon him. But it was not now for Mary's son, the Protestant James, whom she had disinherited, but for Philip himself, to whom she passed on her rights to the English throne. Fr. Persons, S.J., undertook to show that, in any case, he had the better claim by reason of his descent from John of Gaunt. But Sixtus V was not ready to be a party to any mixed enterprise and, when Philip was preparing to strike for a throne, the esteem in which Allen was held must be turned to account.

He was at Spa undergoing treatment for a malady that had brought him near to death, when he received a summons to Rome. The urgency was such that he went as soon as he was able to travel, without returning to Rheims, and he never again saw his College. Though his presence was immediately required to straighten out a fresh difficulty at the English College, where the students were agitating for the removal of the Jesuit superiors, he was soon to be engaged upon greater matters. About the same time Fr. Persons, S.J., had arrived in Rome. In 1588 Olivares, the Spanish Ambassador at Rome, wrote to Philip: "Fr. Robert Persons, the Jesuit, will go with Allen. In all the dealings which I have had with him here I find in him great fertility of resource and very good discretion. The Cardinal also is very judicious, although he adapts himself badly to the lies and trickery here current, his own methods being very different." Three years of close contact with both men had given him abundant opportunity to know the relationship in which they stood and the disposition of each; and the words which follow: "I keep him well in remembrance of what he owes your Majesty, and he shows that he knows it perfectly," are significant.

Olivares had written, two years before: "I have not

touched upon the subject of Allen's cardinalate, for I think it very fitting, as your Majesty says, that it should progress at the same pace as the enterprise, if that is not to be delayed; since in that case the Theatine [i.e., Fr. Persons] says it would be of great importance in keeping the Catholics in good heart. . . . As this good man suffers need, I should think it no harm if your Majesty were to grant him some assistance, which, so long as he is not a cardinal, might be 1,000 crowns, or five hundred would not be bad. I think it very important to lay under an obligation this man who will have to lead the whole cause, and on whom it will chiefly depend to move the Pope to what your Majesty desires about the Succession." And when Allen was congratulated upon his elevation by the College at Rheims, he replied that "whatever cause of joy this gives you, so much the more are you, to whom I am so dear, bound by a fresh bond of love and gratitude to the whole Society, and especially to our old and singularly good father and principal fellow-labourer; for next under God, Fr. Persons has made me cardinal."

We are now less surprised at the unwisdom of the "Letter written by Mr. Doctor Allen concerning the yielding up of the City of Daventer unto his Catholic Majesty by Sir William Stanley, Kt.," than were those Catholics of England who "resolved that Mr. Allen would never have overshott himself so foully in these times contrary to his former writings and protestations," and that if it were not actually the work of an enemy, some "simple man (perhaps of zeale) hath set forth this book under the name of Dr. Allen." Upon the "Admonition to the Nobility and People of England and Ireland, concerning the present Wars made for the Execution of His Holiness' Sentence by the high and mighty King Catholic of Spain," put forward under his name in the following year, it is sufficient present comment that the words he had penned in his reply to Burleigh four years earlier, could never again be employed: "In all which books no Protestant in England is able to reprove the writers of any untruth or slander, railing, immodesty, or misbehaviour towards our secular Princess or persecutors; whatsoever the libeller without proof affirmeth here. Wherein I avow him to be so much destitute of truth, as he is not able

to allege one line, or sentence, or any one example out of our writings to the contrary."

It has been aptly said that the excommunication of Elizabeth was a blunder, because it failed. The clauses as affecting the Catholics in England had been suspended almost immediately. But those in exile solidly held it "better to attain to eternal bliss under a foreign lord than to be cast into the depths of hell by an enemy at home," and in any judgment of their action, account must be taken of this reality.

Incredible as it appeared to Elizabeth and her advisers, Allen's political ideas and acts were never allowed within the doors of his college. Prudence alone would have dictated this course, even if experience of the havoc wrought through racial contention at the English College had been absent. But his caution exceeded mere human prudence. It was not merely among the students that he was dumb on these matters, but even with one in whom he reposed such confidence as to choose him as his successor in the presidency. Dr. Barret told Agazzari in a letter 14th April, 1583: "About Father Robert [Persons] I think no one here knows anything except Dr. Allen, who is so secret as not to be willing to share his knowledge with a single person." Allen has himself testified that all such matters were deliberately excluded at the seminary, and has given the reason, "the governors of the students always of purpose prohibiting, and as much as in such numbers of all sorts (not all ever having discretion to season their zeal) could be, providing that in the course of our school questions and controversies concerning the Pope's pre-eminence, no matter of depriving or excommunicating princes should be disputed; no, not so much as in generalities, and much less in particularizing of any point of our Queen's case . . . because it is incident to matter of State (as now our country most unfortunately standeth), and consequently might be interpreted by the suspicious to be meant of her, whose case men liked least to deal in" and he is able to point in all confidence to the fact that not a single priest can be shown "to have either in public or private dissuaded any one person in the realm from his obedience in civil causes to the Queen," nor to have uttered "no, nor at the hour of their death and martyrdom, no nor ever before

in any of their confessions to the magistrate, any disloyal word against her Majesty." It was not a matter of principle, not of mere policy, for Allen to keep the college true to the object of its foundation, that of forming priests to work with purely spiritual aids for the Catholic cause in England at the risk of their lives.

The Cardinal of England lived in poverty, and died in debt; but he bequeathed a heritage that has never ceased to profit the country he so sincerely loved and continues to this day her unfailing resource, those colleges—now happily many—from which came her martyrs and those inspired with their spirit.

## WERE THE APOSTLES ILLITERATE AND INDIGENT ?

BY THE REV. T. E. BIRD, D.D., Ph.D.,

Vice-Rector of Oscott College.

THE pulpit sometimes stresses the lowly state (social and intellectual) of the Apostles of Our Lord Jesus Christ. Not only are they spoken of as "illiterate and ignorant men"—words taken from the mouths of their enemies (Acts iv. 13)—but they are also introduced with qualificatives such as "rough," "rude," "uncultured," "of the poorest class," etc. Somewhere recently I saw the expression "a gang of toughs" applied to the members of the College of the Apostles.<sup>1</sup>

The questions we ask are: Is this good? Is it true? What good purpose is served by demeaning the Apostles to the level of illiterate paupers? The points the preacher usually has in view are to show that Christ Our Lord did not despise the poor and lowly, that He loves all souls and is no respecter of persons; and that it is harder for the rich to enter the Kingdom of Heaven than it is for the poor. All this is laudable. But when illustrations may do more harm than good, and when they are misrepresentations, it would seem better to choose other examples. For the picture of a rude and unlettered group of Apostles is eagerly seized upon by certain rationalists who are out to destroy the Christian Faith at all costs. "Your knowledge of Christ," they say, "is derived from impressions received and afterwards recorded by men who are utterly unreliable witnesses. What educated person to-day would take as 'gospel truth' (!) statements made by a few illiterate, simple-minded, superstitious fishermen! We smile at the abnormal credulity of these folk who are so easily

<sup>1</sup> The prize should go to a good religious, who, at a clergy retreat, during a "meditation" on the call of the Apostles, imagined Christ walking along the jetty at Capharnaum, at the end of which were Peter, Andrew, and others, "seeing who could spit the farthest"!

gulled. We admit that persons of this type have no wish to deceive or to give wrong impressions; but their very up-bringing and lack of mental training tell against their being able to present facts in true perspective and with the proper colours." Thus speak these loud-mouthed scoffers. And the handle they want is held out to them by Christian preachers who talk about poor, ignorant and illiterate Apostles!

Is it true that the Apostles were poor and illiterate? Let us examine the facts:

PETER AND ANDREW. We may couple these two because they were brothers. Now the Gospel narrative shows that there was an important company or association of fishermen with boats on the Lake of Galilee.<sup>2</sup> The captain of these men was undoubtedly Peter. He has his own boat (Lk. v. 3); to him Christ gives the order to put out to sea (v. 4); he has authority to command the nets to be lowered (v. 5); the sons of Zebedee were in partnership with Simon (κοινωνοὶ τῷ Σίμωνι). In John xxi. it is Simon Peter who decides the fishing expedition; the others follow his lead: he takes charge of drawing up the net to land. To the captain alone Christ said: "Henceforth thou shalt catch men" (Lk. v. 10). By his station in life, before "they left all things and followed Him," Simon was naturally prepared to be the Captain of the Twelve and the first Captain of Christ's Church.

Peter was used to all kinds of fishing. On one occasion Our Lord told him to go and fish with a *hook* (Matt. xvii. 27). In the same Gospel we read of him (with Andrew) throwing the large *casting net* (iv. 18).<sup>3</sup> But more interesting is the account in Luke v. where we read of *two* boats launched for deep sea fishing, together with the account of a later incident (John xxi.), where we find a "boat" (vv. 3, 6) attended by a "little boat." In all probability this denotes fishing with a "stop

<sup>2</sup> It is said that even to-day the fishermen of Tiberias form a kind of corporation with fixed rules. See Hastings, *Dict. of Christ and Gospels*, I, 598.

<sup>3</sup> See an account of a man using the "amphiblestron" in Herodotus, I, 141.



seine." "Now a seine of this description was the most expensive piece of machinery known in that calling. It is very expensive nowadays; it was far more so then, when net had to be braided by hand. Moreover, it requires a big crew to work it, and consequently has always been financed by either a wealthy capitalist or a number of fairly well-to-do men in partnership." Peter, therefore, does not appear to have been a very poor man; and we must not forget that every Jew was bound to follow a trade. On the intellectual side, a study of St. Peter's discourses in the Acts, and of his Epistles (the first Epistle, especially, shows that he knew how to write good Greek), easily disposes of the charge that he was "illiterate and ignorant." We may say that his brother Andrew would be of the same social and intellectual standing.

JAMES AND JOHN. It is not difficult to show that the sons of Zebedee were neither poor nor illiterate. Their father Zebedee was able to pay men employed in his service (Mk. i. 20). By comparing Matt. xxvii. 56 with Mk. xv. 40; xvi. 1, we gather that their mother was Salome, one of the devout ladies of Galilee who ministered to the temporal needs of Christ and His Apostles (Mk. xv. 40; Lk. viii. 3). When we remember that this good woman gave not only her money but also her two sons for the furtherance of the Gospel, we need not wonder why, on a certain occasion, she had confidence enough to ask that, in return for all she had done, her two sons might be appointed chief viziers in the great Messianic Kingdom, which she (and they) was expecting.<sup>5</sup> However, to be able to support herself and her two sons, besides subscribing to Our Lord's needs, she must have been rather well-to-do. Consequently, when her sons were younger she would not have neglected to give them the advantage of the educational facilities that Galilee afforded. Certainly the boys would have attended a synagogue school; and they may have passed on to a Greek school. One has only to study the Aramaic underlying the Greek of the Johannine

\* See art. *The Fisherman as Expositor*, by Rev. Nicholas Oliver, in *Expository Times*, Vol. XXVIII, 5, p. 230.

<sup>5</sup> Matt. xx. 20ff; Mk. x. 35ff.

writings to come to the conclusion that the Beloved Disciple was far from uneducated.<sup>6</sup>

John is a name that is found in priestly families. He was known to the high priest (xviii. 15). He alone tells us that the name of the high priest's servant was Malchus (xviii. 10); and that one of the men who led Peter into denial was "Malchus' kinsman" (xviii. 26). John appears to have had property in Jerusalem (xix. 27).<sup>7</sup> According to Polycrates, in his old age at Ephesus John wore the priestly mitre or petalon.<sup>8</sup> From these facts it would seem that the Zebedee family was connected with the priestly class in Jerusalem. And the priestly class was the aristocratic class. St. Jerome is undoubtedly right when he says: "Unde et Jesus Joannem evangelistam amabat plurimum, qui *propter generis nobilitatem* erat notus Pontifici, et Judaeorum insidias non timebat."<sup>9</sup> Yet, as we have seen above, James and John were under Peter, the captain of the band of fishermen.

Before we consider the other Apostles it will be well here to examine the meaning of the phrase "illiterate

<sup>6</sup> The rationalists, of course, deny the authenticity of the Johannine writings; but this is not the place to refute their objections. However, there are signs of a return to the traditional authorship among certain liberal critics; but with this return they are bringing new difficulties, based on pre-Christian Gnosticism.

<sup>7</sup> εἰς τὰ ἰδία may not necessarily mean this. The expression means that St. John took Our Lady into his own family, as one of his own kith and kin. Cp. Jo. i. 11; viii. 44; xv. 19. In the papyri ἰδιος is used for addressing near relatives. See Moulton and Milligan: *Vocabulary of the Greek Testament*, sub voce.

<sup>8</sup> For "petalon" see Exod. xxviii. 36 (LXX. 32); xxix. 6. It is usual to dub Polycrates' statement (apud Eusebius, H.E. v. 24: P.G., 20, 493) as "fantastic" and "absurd." But the very strangeness of the expression tells against its being an invention; and the fact that it occurs in an official letter addressed to Pope Victor (c. A.D. 190), after consultation with other bishops, speaks loudly in its favour. It must have had some foundation in fact. The objection that in the same letter Polycrates confuses Philip the Apostle with Philip the deacon is answered by Abbot Chapman in *John the Presbyter*, p. 64ff.

<sup>9</sup> Epist. 127, 5. P.L., 22, 1090.

and ignorant men" (Douay),<sup>10</sup> whereby the Sanhedrin's opinion of Peter and John is expressed in Acts iv. 13.

St. Peter had just made a fearless speech before this august Jewish Senate, and he had given an interpretation of a passage of the Scriptures. This interpretation of Scripture was held to be the duty solely of the Rabbis or Scribes. Hence St. Peter's judges "were astounded." "These men are agrammatoi," they said. "They have never studied τὰ ἱερὰ γράμματα." We might paraphrase the word by saying: "they have never taken a degree or studied at a Rabbinical school." They said the same of Our Lord: "How hath this man acquired letters (γράμματα), never having studied?" (John vii. 15). It would seem then that the Sanhedrin did not consider Peter and John "illiterate" in our modern sense of the word. Let us turn to the second term they used, *ιδιώται*. This word means simply a private person as distinct from one who holds a public office. In 1 Cor. xiv. 16, 23 it denotes the layman who does not preach publicly in church. In 2 Cor. xi. 6 St. Paul uses it when he says he is not a trained speaker. So also Epictetus describes himself as *ιδιώτης* in contrast to rhetoricians and philosophers. The common use of the word in the papyri is "a private person."<sup>11</sup> So our English translation is incorrect. The Sanhedrin did not think that Peter and John were "ignorant"; on the contrary it was amazed at the speech just delivered by Peter, since it was delivered by a private individual who was not a public teacher. So the Apostles were dismissed with a caution not to do any more public speaking or teaching in the Name of Jesus (v. 18).

Let us see whether others of the Twelve were poor and ignorant. PHILIP. He belonged to the same town as Peter, Andrew, James and John. Probably he was a friend of theirs before his call. His Greek name, coupled with the fact that he was approached by the Greek visitors to the Temple when they wished to see Jesus (John xii. 20, 21), suggests that he was of Gentile origin. He does not figure in any of the fishing expeditions; hence it is fairly certain that he was not a fisherman.

<sup>10</sup> The original Rheims edition had: "men unlettered and of the vulgar sort."

<sup>11</sup> See Moulton and Milligan, *sub voce*, p. 299.

His question to Our Lord: "Whence are we to buy loaves that these may eat?" followed by the remark: "Two hundred shillings' worth of loaves would not be enough that every one might receive a little" (John vi. 5, 7), leads one to think that before his call he was engaged in business or trade. Galilee was the trading-centre of Palestine: Jews and Greeks dealt with the merchandise that passed through or was distributed in that district. Certainly there is nothing in the sacred text that leads us to suppose that Philip was without learning or money.

**BARTHOLOMEW.** We assume that he is Nathaniel of the Fourth Gospel (i. 45-48; xxi. 2). He was Philip's friend: he was a fisherman: his home was at Cana of Galilee. His disdainful remark: "Can anything good come from Nazareth!" may suggest that he was a slightly "superior" person; nevertheless his mind was open to conviction and ready for faith—"a true Israelite, in whom there is no guile." The sacred text does not suggest that he was of the lowest class of men.

**MATTHEW.** The custom-house at Capharnaum was of no small importance. The man in charge there would need all his wits about him. His revenue-office was situated on the frontier of Herod Antipas' territory, where the great trade route from Damascus led down to Acre, and over which an enormous quantity of dutiable merchandise was transported day by day. In Galilee the taxes were collected not for the Imperial exchequer, as in Judæa, but for the treasury of Herod Antipas the tetrach. Publicans were of two classes—the wealthy farmers of taxes, who were often of the equestrian order (the rich Zacchæus of Jericho, mentioned in Luke xix. 2, was probably of this class), and their local agents. Matthew probably belonged to this second class. Nevertheless, he must have been fairly rich; for after his conversion he gave a great entertainment (Vulg. "magnum convivium") at his house in honour of Christ, to which he invited many other publicans of the tetrachy and his friends. The Jews hated the tax collectors and held them as public sinners. On one occasion Our Lord couples them with the Gentiles (Matt. xviii. 17); but on the whole He regarded them with love. He mixed freely with them and often sat at table with them (Matt. ix. 10, 11; xi. 19). They listened

respectfully to the teaching of John the Baptist (Lk. iii. 12; vii. 29), and to that of Christ (Lk. xv. 1); thus they were ahead of the chief priests on the way to the Kingdom of Heaven (Matt. xxi. 31, 32). And we all know the Parable of the Pharisee and the Publican. At the Capharnaum custom-house Matthew would daily use his pen. We may then easily imagine that, after his call, he not only listened to the sublime words and parables of his Master, but also committed them to writing, at least in the form of notes. It is not improbable that these notes later on formed the basis of the catechetical instruction given to the converts, and, subsequently, of the Synoptic record of Our Lord's ministry and teaching. Matthew, therefore, appears to have been neither poor nor illiterate. We might compare him with a modern civil servant in the customs or revenue department.

THOMAS. The Gospels do not furnish sufficient data for us to say what was the status of this Apostle before his call. As his name is among those who went on the fishing expedition (John xxi.) we may consider it not unlikely that he also was a fisherman under the captaincy of Peter.

JAMES, JUDE (Thaddeus), SIMON (Zelotes<sup>12</sup>: Aramaic "Cananean"). It would take us beyond the scope of this enquiry to give the reasons which strongly incline us to identify these three Apostles with three men of the same names and mentioned together (with a Joseph) in Matthew xiii. 55 who are "the brethren of the Lord." True, we must avoid hasty identifications, but the weight of the evidence surely is in favour of the conclusions arrived at by St. Jerome when he wrote against Helvidius fifteen hundred and fifty years ago.<sup>13</sup> For our

<sup>12</sup> Not because Simon was a member of the political party of the Zealots, but because of his zeal for religion was he so called: cp. Gal. 1. 14; Acts xxii. 3.

<sup>13</sup> The best modern article on the question is that written by Abbot Chapman in *Journal of Theological Studies*, April, 1906. Appendix I of Vol. IV. of the *Westminster Version* deals with the same subject, but is perhaps over cautious. One of the common arguments of those who oppose the identification is that "His brethren did not believe in Him" (John vii. 5). This unbelief was due to the fact that Christ would not

purpose we may say that if these Apostles were not Our Lord's brethren we know nothing of their social and intellectual status before Christ called them; but if they were His "brethren" (probably the sons of Our Lady's sister-in-law), then we may conjecture that they would have received the same education as Our Lord Himself received in His Boyhood and Youth.

JUDAS ISCARIOT. Our Lord made this man the treasurer of the Apostolic band. Doubtless he possessed qualities required for filling that office; hence we may conclude that before his call he was used to handling money. It would be interesting to know whether there was any connection between his father Simon Iscariot (John vi. 72) and the Simon who complained about the anointing in Luke vii. 39. Presuming that the penitent in Luke vii. is Mary, sister of Lazarus, both Simon and Judas had a grudge against her, although for different reasons.<sup>14</sup>

"manifest Himself to the world" (vii. 4). Yet it is precisely *Jude the Apostle* who later is perplexed because Christ will not "manifest Himself to the world" (xiv. 22). The similarity between these two passages is overlooked by the critics: and, indeed, others of the Apostles were "oligopistoi" Matt. xvi. 8. For my own part, I simply cannot believe that one of the three "pillars" of the early Church, a man who is associated with Peter and John, and who figures so prominently in Gal. i. 19, ii. 10, and in Acts xv., and whose name is "James the brother of the Lord" was not one of the Twelve Apostles. Lightfoot on Gal. i. 19 admits that "it seems that St. James is here called an Apostle"; but why he holds that the term Apostle here does not make "James the brother of the Lord" one of the Twelve is, in view of the position occupied by James and the early date of the events, hardly explicable.

<sup>14</sup> Lk. vii. 39; John xii. 5. Certainly it was at the house of Simon "the leper" that Mary, sister of Lazarus and Martha, anointed Our Lord; but whereas St. John tells us her name, SS. Matthew and Mark simply say "a woman" (Matt. xxvi. 7; Mark xiv. 3; John xi. 2; xii. 3). St. Luke speaks of "a woman" anointing Our Lord at the house of Simon "a Pharisee." This evangelist, alone of the four, omits the anointing six days before the final passover; but does he give the same incident earlier on, and does he bring out rather Simon's complaint simply to illustrate the words of Our Lord (given immediately before, vii. 34): "The Son of man is come *eating and drinking*; and you say. Behold a man that is a glutton and a drinker of wine, *a friend of publicans and sinners*?"



We may now sum up the results of our enquiry in the following table :—

PETER : Captain of a band of prosperous fishermen : educated.

ANDREW : his brother.

JAMES } sons of well-to-do parents; connected with the  
JOHN } aristocratic (priestly) class in Jerusalem; both well educated.

PHILIP : probably a business man, and a Greek.

BARTHOLOMEW : not of the lowest class.

MATTHEW : a civil servant.

THOMAS : probably a fisherman.

JAMES } if Our Lord's cousins, they will have been  
JUDE } brought up like He was at Nazareth. Two  
SIMON } of them wrote epistles in Greek.

In conclusion, may we venture to say that it is from homes such as these Apostles knew, that we draw some of the best of the diocesan or secular clergy that carry on the work of the Apostles in our midst to-day?

## PAROCHIAL CREDIT UNIONS

By GREGORY MACDONALD.

THE credit union is a co-operative bank. The recent organization of parochial credit unions in the United States—where this name for co-operative banks has been popularized—makes them a subject of special interest for us, but they have proved of outstanding value in all parts of Europe and the world since the middle of the nineteenth century. In England, the possibilities of co-operative banking for the encouragement of thrift and for application to the problems of usury seems to have aroused the enthusiasm only of a few pioneers, but these created a considerable literature,<sup>1</sup> and their effort caused the system to be applied in India so successfully that the village banks are widely regarded as the most striking benefit of English rule—to be compared, then, with the Lloyd Irrigation Barrage or with the building of roads and bridges. In Europe, although men of all creeds have worked together to organize credit unions in towns, villages and workshops, the normal unit has been the parish, whether Catholic or Lutheran, for in the parish community there exists already an element of co-operation more enduring than that of economic self-interest. It is symbolical of the spirit fostered by Frederick William Raiffeisen, who founded his banks for the most part in parishes up and down Germany, that when he died, in 1888, he was mourned by the people as “Father Raiffeisen.” The remarkable work of the Belgian Boerenbond, founded in 1890 by the Abbé Mellaerts, is another example of co-operative societies, and especially co-operative credit societies, establishing a new relation between pastors and

<sup>1</sup> The most authoritative writings in England are by Henry W. Wolff. His *People's Banks* (P. S. King, 10s. 6d.) is a detailed survey of the whole subject. The latest edition appeared only in 1919, so that recent developments are not touched upon, but it remains extremely valuable, and has often been consulted for this article. A publication of the present year, *Co-operative Banking*, by N. Barou (P. S. King, 15s.) provides a detailed statistical survey over a wide area, and it has the advantage of being very fully documented. A pamphlet on simple rules for a co-operative bank is in course of publication by the Distributist League, 2, Little Essex Street, W.C.2.

people in a Catholic community.<sup>2</sup>

The American title serves very well to describe the purpose of the co-operative bank. It is a union of credit, a common pool of savings, regularly contributed by the members of some definite community and administered by the members themselves, in accordance with the law of the State, so that loans may be granted, for provident purposes, to members who would otherwise either resort to usurers or else lack credit facilities altogether; the money accruing from the repayment of loans at interest may be distributed as dividends or put back to reserve. It would be possible to annotate this definition at length, but certain of its essentials should be emphasized. The regular payment of savings into a common fund creates a habit of thrift which is of value in itself, but all the more valuable when the savings are devoted to the relief of those who are in need; the true purpose of the credit union is to place at the disposal of poor men a fund from which they may borrow money, not as from a philanthropist, a professional money-lender, or an anonymous State Bank, but from their own neighbours on the strength of their own character. The credit union is "a capitalization of honesty," possible in a community of which the members are interested in one another's welfare, and aware of one another's difficulties, but it is not a club of the more prosperous to help the more impoverished; for every contributor is a potential borrower. The credit union is not a mutual aid society merely, but a business enterprise. The combined credit of the people is put to good use. The purpose of a loan is sharply scrutinized. It must be either *remedial*, so as to take a man out of the hands of money-lenders, or pay the expenses of an illness or a funeral; or else it must be *constructive*, so as to enable a man to stock his shop or barrow, to buy tools, or to prepare for the marketing of his harvest. As a business enterprise the credit union insists upon the payment of interest to maintain the value of the loan. On the other hand, as a voluntary loan association, the credit union works

<sup>2</sup> The yearly *Rapport* of the Belgian Boerenbond gives a summary of all these activities. See also *Fondation et Organisation d'une Caisse Rurale d'après le Système Raiffeisen*, by the Abbé Mellaerts. This early publication of the Boerenbond at Louvain is a catechism which explains very well the aims behind the Raiffeisen movement.

with no overhead charges, or with overhead charges reduced to the barest minimum.

The system has a varied ancestry which may be traced back to the earlier Scottish "cash credits," or to Robert Owen and to the Rochdale Pioneers. It was in Germany that Victor Aime Hüber applied the idea of co-operation to credit, and in Germany two remarkable men successfully carried out Hüber's suggestion after the great crop failure of 1846. It may be noticed, in parenthesis, that credit unions come out of necessity: the Belgian Boerenbond originated in a prolonged agricultural crisis, the Banca Popolare of Milan sprang into prominence in the financial crisis which followed the outbreak of war in 1866, and the Catholic parish credit unions of America have been largely organized since 1929.

Herman Schulze-Delitsch, the first of the experimenters, was a townsman and something of a "philanthropist," whose system contained many features incorporated in credit union practice abroad, though it lacked the essential purpose of assisting the very poor. Among his artisans, shop-keepers and clerks he made it clear that the co-operative bank should be first and last a business concern. He drew its members from any large mixed area, insisted upon an entrance fee, and upon remuneration for officials. The applicant for admission had to be already in a position to contribute money for the purchase of a share, and the share was substantial, as a pledge of the member's security. Originally fixed at about £5, the value of the shares has increased until it stands in the Schulze-Delitsch banks at a mean figure of about £17. It is clear that while this system makes an excellent savings bank for the urban middle classes, and a loan bank as well, paying high dividends, it still does not serve the needs of the very poor, who find the high price of shares a barrier to admission. Nevertheless, the organization which Schulze-Delitsch began with a capital of £28 in 1850, grew within ten years to number 364 banks with 48,000 members. When he died, in 1883, there were 1,910 Schulze-Delitsch banks with 500,000 members. In 1911 the loans made by Schulze-Delitsch banks amounted to the huge total of 221 million pounds, and just after the War there were 12,000 of these banks in Germany.

A greater man, and one of the greatest figures of the last century, was Frederick William Raiffeisen, who faced different problems in a different spirit. His first interest was in the agricultural areas where there were many of the very poor, where usury was rampant, and where it was obviously impossible to expect a consistent contribution for shares, or a regular repayment of loans, because a farmer's income depends upon the harvest and the weather; if he borrows money he can pay it back only after a long period. Raiffeisen insisted first of all that a bank should be formed in some local area, where each man knows his neighbour. There was no entrance fee, or share to be paid up. The only qualification was the known good character of the individual who applied for admission. All paid into a common pool whatever they could afford. If a member desired a loan he had to appear before a committee of three of his neighbours, state how much he wanted, what use he intended for the money, and on what terms he could repay it. The credit committee might suggest modifications or improvements in his plan; they might refuse his application; but if they accepted his guarantees he would have the money, no matter how poor he was. In the system of Raiffeisen, unlike the system of Schulze-Delitsch, there were no fees, no dividends. All profits went to a yearly reserve fund as to one-third, to allow for bad debts, and the rest to a common reserve fund, built up against such emergencies as a drought or a failure of crops. It was only when Schulze-Delitsch pressed upon the German legislature the necessity for shares in such enterprises that shares were permitted in the Raiffeisen banks; then they were restricted to ten shillings, which could be paid by instalments.

When Raiffeisen was asked how he would achieve the impossible task of collecting money from the impoverished peasants of the Westerwald; when he was asked from where would the money come; he pointed to Heaven and replied: "From there." And it came. The Westerwald was transformed, the usurer was driven out, mortgages were paid off, implements and fertilizers were bought, cottages were rebuilt, the fields bore crops. The Raiffeisen banks grew in number, especially after they proved their value during a German depression in 1893. In 1928 there were over 40,000 Raiffeisen societies in Germany alone, not to speak of numberless credit

unions in foreign countries organized according to the same principles. For Raiffeisen's were the root ideas which inspired the pioneers, and it was not long before remarkable achievements were effected, especially with the support of the Catholic priesthood, by disciples who adapted the methods of Schulze-Delitsch and Raiffeisen to different local conditions in town and country. Most astonishing of all was the creation of a peasant democracy in the Polish provinces of Poznan and Pomorze, which was effected in large part by parish priests. The Land Settling Fund of the Prussian Government, set up by Bismarck in 1866, had at its disposal the sum of 700,000,000 marks for the purpose of buying up Polish estates and settling German colonists upon them; but the People's Banks, organized from Poznan, collected the resources of the population and bought for the peasants, by 1914, more than ten times as much land as the Fund acquired from the landowners.<sup>3</sup>

In Italy, there were two Jews, Luigi Luzzatti and Leone Wollemborg, of whom the former organized co-operative banks which now do one-third of the banking business of Italy, while the latter transformed the countryside of Venezia by means of his *casse rurali*. As Luzzatti was at one time Premier of Italy and Wollemborg Minister of Finance, it is easy to imagine by what secularist influences they were surrounded, yet "their unselfish work, begun early in life, has been rendered doubly effective by the support of the Catholic Church and the State."<sup>4</sup> Meanwhile, the Catholic clergy undertook the same work directly, organizing their banks, under diocesan control, in connection with other co-operative activities and with special attention to the needs of the very poor. The *Piccolo Credito Bergamasco*<sup>5</sup> remains the most notable example, but such institutions as the *Banco Ambrosiano* of Milan or the *Piccolo Credito Romagnolo* are equally famous.

<sup>3</sup> See *A Bulwark of Democracy*, by "Augur." Appleton, 1931.

<sup>4</sup> A quotation from *Rural Credits* by Myron T. Herrick, who studied this subject enthusiastically during his diplomatic career; it is cited by Roy F. Bergengren in *Credit Union: A Co-operative Banking Book*.

<sup>5</sup> The Bergamo co-operative movement is described by the Rev. J. R. Meagher, "Catholic Social Action in Bergamo," *The Month*, May, 1911; and further details are to be found in Wolff, *op. cit.*, Chapter X, "The Banche Popolari of Italy."



The American experiments deserve particular attention here, because they are recent, successful, and carried out, so far as the industrial towns are concerned, under conditions not unlike our own. And an examination of the American figures shows what magnificent results can be achieved by the credit union system once its principles are widely known. In fact, the American credit banks deal in such large figures that we might suspect there a not unusual love of record sums for their own sake, save that caution and prudence have to be the very essence of the idea. Here are two examples of American success: the Bell Telephone Company employees started a credit union with a capital of \$4.60, which has grown in ten years to \$1,500,000; and the post office employees' system which began in 1923 with one credit union of eight members, holding \$18.50, numbered at the end of 1930 as many as 245 credit unions, with 40,574 members, holding \$3,338,219. The total number of loans made up to 1930 was 125,385 and the amount of the loans was \$15,234,889, the average loan being therefore about a hundred and twenty dollars, or about twenty-five pounds. According to my latest information (April, 1932) there has been no case in America of a credit union going into involuntary liquidation owing to the general financial crisis, while the ordinary small banks with their speculative investments have failed in thousands.

Any priest who wishes to start a credit union in his parish will do well to follow the American experience, which has been carefully analysed.<sup>6</sup> The priest himself must be interested, and give the scheme judicious publicity from the pulpit, but the credit union cannot be imposed upon the parishioners, nor can the priest interfere in its management, beyond his own duties as a member of a committee, for it is essentially co-operative;

<sup>6</sup> *An Analysis of the Parish Credit Union Development in the United States* is a most comprehensive short report, to October, 1931, drawn up for the Catholic Rural Life Conference, at Wichita, by the Credit Union National Extension Bureau. Its main conclusions will be found summarized in an article: "Parish Credit Unions," *The Month*, February, 1932. The Parish Credit Union National Committee of Washington, has also published pamphlets: *The Parish Credit Union*, by T. J. O'Shaughnessy; *The Purpose of the Credit Union as Related to the Problem of Unemployment*, by Frank O'Hara, Ph.D.; and *Parish Credit Unions*, by Fr. J. M. Campbell.

there must also exist a definite need for credit facilities. A good plan is to begin quietly in some sodality, with the help of a few trusted parishioners who will interest the rank and file. The officers must be men who have already proved themselves anxious to help their fellows, they must live not too far from one another, and they must possess ordinary business ability. The offices should be in the church or near it, say, in the parish hall, so that they can be open to receive savings at definite times. In many churches it might be possible to use a side chapel or the porch, after the Sunday Masses; but, of course, the credit committee, which interviews applicants for loans, should meet in some less public place.

Having studied the system,<sup>7</sup> the priest may call together a first group of ten or twenty. These become the nucleus, if they decide to form a Credit Union after it has been explained to them, and after full opportunity has been given for them to ask questions as to its operation. They draw up the bye-laws. They choose a Board of Directors, large enough to represent all the interests involved, a number usually divisible by three, so that one-third may resign each year, and so preserve a necessary continuity of policy. The same meeting also elects a Credit Committee of three, with the same provision, and a Supervisory Committee of three, whose duty it is to audit all accounts at least once a quarter, and whose right it is to suspend any officer at their own discretion until the next meeting of the members. The Board of Directors conducts the policy of the credit union. At its first monthly meeting it elects from its own number a President, a Vice-President, a Secretary and a Treasurer. The Treasurer is the most important man in the credit union. He is liaison officer between

<sup>7</sup> There is probably no better manual of credit union practice than *Credit Union*, by Roy F. Bergengren, wherein nearly every conceivable difficulty is simply explained. Mr. Bergengren is the indefatigable Secretary of the Credit Union National Extension Bureau, founded out of the private fortune of Mr. Edward A. Filene, a Boston merchant, "to promote thrift and to eliminate usury" by means of credit unions. The Bureau publishes a number of excellent leaflets for distribution in the U.S.A., and my own enquiries were met most generously. *Credit Union*, which has been used for the following pages, appears now to be out of print.

the committees, he receives applications for loans and must, if necessary, be able to call the Credit Committee together at once for an emergency meeting; he must be actively interested, and able to rouse the enthusiasm of others.

The bye-laws provide for the duties of officers, and for the annual general meetings of all the members, where the yearly dividend is distributed. They provide also for the terms of membership; an applicant for membership must have his application counter-signed by a director; and any member who fails to live up to his obligation, or who becomes of notoriously bad character, may be expelled (after a hearing) by the Board of Directors. At general meetings one member has one vote, no matter how large his holding. A member is held strictly accountable for the fulfilment of obligations undertaken for the payment of shares or for the repayment of loans.

The bye-laws provide as well for the mechanics of shares, loans and interest, which may best be explained by describing the growth of a single union. It decides upon an entrance fee of one shilling (a useful cover for the small overhead charges, and upon interest-bearing shares valued at ten shillings, which may be purchased by regular weekly instalments of a shilling or more. In addition, members who wish to save irregular sums can open a deposit account, so that the credit union provides in its activities also for the present facilities of Christmas Clubs and similar ventures. The members decide that they will begin granting loans up to an aggregate of £10 as soon as they have collected £20, for the sooner the money goes out the sooner it comes in, and when the system is in full working order there may be 90% of the money out on loan at any given moment. An account is opened at some local Bank, in the joint names of the President and the Treasurer, and the credit union is registered as a Friendly Society.

The first applicant for a loan is a member who requires £5 to instal a geyser in his bathroom. The Credit Committee looks into his estimates and grants the application, taking his written guarantee to repay by weekly instalments out of salary, say, five shillings a week, with an interest of one per cent. a month on the unpaid balance—that is to say, one per cent. on

the amount of money the borrower has use of for the month. So for the first month he pays one shilling interest, for the second tenpence, for the third sevenpence, for the fourth fivepence, for the fifth twopence—a total interest, roughly calculated, of only three shillings on £5, but every month the credit union has another £1 back from the borrower and available for a new loan. It requires no security, because the member's character, reputation in the parish, and holding in shares is security enough; for a larger loan the written guarantee of two backers might be required, or some negotiable asset. A great number of small loans are customarily unsecured. Although the system is organized with its three committees so as not to allow a loophole for greed or speculation, within those defences the members assume honesty in one another, and deal with credit problems in a human fashion, guided also by that sense of cautious husbandry needed to safeguard the common interests involved. A member who is in arrears in his repayments is fined, say, a penny for each five shillings in arrears.

The second applicant is a member who wishes to borrow £10. On investigation it proves that his purpose is improvident—he wants to invest in some swindling concern which has put out alluring advertisements. The application is refused; and experience shows that in very few cases is a refusal taken in bad part, especially as the Credit Committee will reason out the matter with the applicant. Another member is loaned £8 for a reconstruction of his shop-front; his original estimate was £10, but this was whittled down on the advice of the Credit Committee. A member who has become involved in trouble with an instalment-purchase scheme has the debt discharged by the credit union, and arranges to repay the loan on new terms. A cobbler-member is granted a loan for the purchase of leather. And now comes the real test of the Credit Union. The Treasurer hears by chance at 8 p.m. on a Thursday that X, who is not a member of the Credit Union at all, must pay an instalment on his mortgage next morning or it will be foreclosed. The Treasurer immediately gets into touch with X, calls an emergency meeting of the Credit Committee (who must for that reason live near one another), and reviews the whole position. Arrangements are made for the obligation to be met, the mortgage is

accepted as security, and X has only to undertake that he will become a member of the credit union, paying his entrance fee and share-instalments as he pays off the loan.

The general meeting, at the close of the financial year sees the first dividend declared by the Directors. It is important that this should not be too ambitious, for the credit union exists ultimately for service, not for profit. It is a money-using rather than a money-making concern. Twenty per cent. of the net earnings is put into a reserve fund to safeguard against working losses, and the dividend is paid from the remainder. A common dividend is between 4% and 6%, but it can be less, or more. It is distributed in cash on all paid-up shares, so as to give the member a tangible evidence of what he has accomplished; he may be wise to re-invest it in shares, or he may put it to some other parochial fund.

Such is a brief outline of credit union practice in a parish, showing at least how definitely it solves problems which are only nibbled at by most loan clubs and thrift societies. An organizer in a Catholic parish in England will find that many questions, necessarily ignored in the course of this article, will arise as operations develop, and various local adaptations will probably have to be made; but he should consult such books as those by Wolff and by Bergengren before making any adaptations. Many of them are well-known pitfalls against which there is the warning of experience. The real necessity is to find the right Treasurer. When he is fired with enthusiasm and acquainted with the working of the system, the credit union can develop to any extent from cautious beginnings, with the active co-operation of priest and parishioners. If proof is forthcoming, after a certain period, that there is no future for the credit union in that parish, it can be voluntarily liquidated with a minimum of risk.

## THE TEACHING AND PREACHING OF MORAL THEOLOGY

BY THE REV. BENEDICT L. LAVAUD, O.P., Ph.D., S.T.L.,  
Professor of Moral Theology at Fribourg University (Switzerland).

**P**REACHING is of divine law "*Prædicate Evangelium.*" The spoken word will always be the chief means of Christian instruction for the reason that it is the most living. The priest has the duty of instructing the faithful from the pulpit; he has the further obligation of imparting instruction to the individual soul, whether in the confessional, or in a private interview. Strictly speaking, this oral instruction should be adequate for the needs of the faithful. Many cannot or have not the opportunity to read, whereas all are bound to attend church services, and thus have the advantage of the sermon preached at the principal parish Mass; or they attend another Mass on Sundays and Feast-Days, at which, in recent years, it is customary to preach a short sermon—a practice that has eminent sanction in the Code of Canon Law.<sup>1</sup> Catholic preaching embraces the whole of Christian doctrine—both dogma and moral. If the presentation ought always to be accommodated to the varying capacities and individual needs of the hearers, it is absolutely necessary that every dogmatic truth should find its place in the development of a Course of Sermons. Those which are most impugned by the unbelieving should be expounded with greater emphasis. The doctrine on Hell is a good example of this. To-day the devil strives to make himself unknown that he may the more easily bring about the ruin of souls. It is forgetfulness or denial of the doctrine of Hell—the lot of the devil and the damned—that counts for so much in the machinations of the great seducer.

It happens too often that the Church's teaching on Eternal Punishment is presented in a manner scarcely suitable, either to convince those whose faith is more or less tainted with Rationalism, or to preserve and

<sup>1</sup> Codex Jur. Can. c. 1345.



strengthen the faith of those who are menaced by doubt. It would be better not to speak of Hell at all than to put forward as articles of faith certain fantastic descriptions of the pain of sense, such as are found in certain meditation manuals compiled for the use of religious. The dreamings of poets, and still more, those of certain exponents of discursive mental prayer, cannot be safely put forward as the true expression of Catholic doctrine; but a serious, grave and dignified exposition of the Church's teaching, even an adaptation of the profound explanations of the great theologians, is better suited to increase faith in souls and to bear much fruit.

However, in this short article, we are not concerned with purely dogmatic instruction. Our purpose is to put before our fellow-priests, and especially those who are called to the care of souls, some simple reflections on the preaching of morals. Now, on this point, we say without hesitation that the ease with which the priest will impart moral instruction to the faithful depends very largely on the manner in which he himself has studied morals during his Seminary or University course. Hence, we may add, in passing—as an encouragement for professors—that every improvement in the method of teaching theology manifests itself years afterwards in a similar progress in the art of preaching. The pulpit re-echoes the lecture-hall. It is this fact that should excite also those who are responsible for the education of the clergy to examine their professional consciences to find out and correct, if possible, the faults and lacunæ which cannot ultimately fail to injure a priest's ministry and redound unfavourably on the souls committed to his care. This examination and correction are all the more necessary if the benefits of theological training given to young clerics are to spring forth undiminished in the instructions given to the faithful—while, on the other hand, the deficiencies of the professor are likely to be amplified in the sermons of those to whom such teaching was imparted.

Now, it is no secret, and we are sure that no offence can be given by saying it, that too often and for too long a time, the teaching of theology has not afforded sufficiently direct and proximate opportunities to priests to preach to the people with the results for which we might reasonably hope.

Correctly speaking, there are not two theologies—one moral and another dogmatic—but one, and only one theology, at once eminently speculative and practical, in which all the dogmatic truths, which it exposes scientifically, have a certain “*valeur de vie*,” and concern, either directly or indirectly, the conduct of human life. The faith which adheres to all dogma, that is, to the principles of all theological science, is a virtue, that is to say, an interior principle of moral human activity, and its acts are, first and foremost, moral acts.

One of the great achievements of St. Thomas was to emphasize (in the beginning of the *Summa*) with admirable clarity this profound *unity* of the science of theology. He cautiously avoided dismembering it into several distinct sciences. God Himself, in the Unity of His Essence, and Trinity of Persons, God as the Efficient Cause of Creation and Conservation, God as the Final Cause, God made Man and Our Redeemer, “dwelling amongst us,” living in His Church and acting by His Sacraments—such is the object of theology. God as the ultimate supernatural end to be reached by our activity, the supernatural end of creatures, elevated and made to participate in the divine nature by sanctifying grace, which is communicated and increased by the sacraments, helped and stimulated by actual grace and the movements of the Holy Ghost—behold the object of the theology which we call “practical” or “moral,” which finds its place in the scheme of theology without detracting in the slightest way from its unity. Hence it is, that though we normally refer to the Second Part of the *Summa* as the “Moral Part,” it is not exclusively nor entirely so, since it is in the Third Part that the Angelic Doctor treats of the Sacraments, which are the instruments of Christ’s humanity and which St. Thomas so appropriately calls the “relics of the Divine Incarnation.”

It would be easy to demonstrate the practical importance of each dogma and of each treatise of dogmatic theology; besides the necessity for the “*ex professo*” moralist, of keeping them ever before his mind. In this connection, how feasible it is that the treatise “*De Gratia*,” which St. Thomas places in the Moral Part of the *Summa* parallel to the treatise “*De Legibus*” (grace being a participation in the life of God, while law is His mani-

festation to us of His Will in our regard), should keep its proper place in moral theology. Now, in the modern system of treating theology, the treatise on Grace is made part of Dogmatic Theology. This, no doubt, is largely to be attributed to the numerous speculative disputes on the nature of sanctifying grace and justification, and on the efficacy of actual grace. Probably with a view to avoiding repetition, many works on Moral Theology contain no treatise on Grace. I am quite well aware that our young students of theology study their Moral and Dogma conjointly, and they are encouraged to make a synthesis, to re-unite what is disjoined only for mere reasons of pedagogy or convenience. Nevertheless, the absence of a treatise on Grace from the study of Moral Theology has far more drawbacks than are commonly realized, drawbacks which are ill compensated for by mere references to the subject of Grace, made from time to time by the professor.

What we have said concerning the Treatise on Grace is no less true of the Treatise on Faith. The analysis of the act of faith, fraught as it is with many difficulties, is left to Fundamental Theology or Apologetics (some going so far as to claim that Apologetics is a science in a class of its own, quite distinct from the science of theology in the wide sense!). The Treatise on Faith, by which St. Thomas introduces us so admirably to the "*Secunda Secundae*," being dealt with in Fundamental Theology, we find that in the study of moral, consideration is given only to questions, which are directly practical, touching the number of truths, belief in which is necessary for salvation, and a list of circumstances in which there is an obligation to make an act of faith, or to profess our faith externally.

The treatises, "*De Spe*" and "*De Caritate*," are significant, not because of the number or magnitude of the questions with which they deal, but because of their immense intrinsic importance. This fact is thoroughly realized by the author of the *Summa*, who gives such prominence to the brilliant array of principles governing these two virtues. Authors who draw their inspiration from the Thomistic synthesis show that they are equally alive to the prominence which is due to the virtues of Hope and Charity—a striking contrast with those who in favouring this deplorable tendency to condense and

eliminate, present these virtues to the student, pared and pruned to such an extent that even the essence of the virtue is scarcely left. In dealing with Charity, for instance, love of the neighbour is emphasized, and the works of mercy are carefully enumerated, but sufficient pains are not taken to explain in the first place what *constitutes* Charity, to impress upon us that Charity is above all, the friendship of God and man, and that love of the neighbour, like supernatural love of self, is only an extension, between men and angels, of the friendship which unites them, or can unite them—each one personally to God.

These changes and lacunæ are largely due to a false progress of Casuistry. God forbid that we should make an unjust accusation against Casuistry—an art which is not only lawful, but very necessary if the universal conclusions of Moral Theology are to be applied to individual cases, and to the infinite variety of human acts in the concrete. Without it no priest, no matter how conversant he may be with the principles of Moral Theology, can become a prudent pastor of souls or a wise confessor. Theological science even though prolonged and helped by casuistry, is not sufficient for success. The knowledge of Moral Theology and Casuistry are indispensable but the *heart* must *be purified*—otherwise there can be no prudence either for oneself or for others.

We have neither the desire nor the intention to condemn those authors and professors who wish to impart to the young Levite in the quickest possible manner this theological knowledge and the art of casuistry, which is its necessary complement. But it may perhaps be too often forgotten that the science of Moral Theology is quite a different thing from Casuistry even at its best. Moral Theology does not simply deal with the sins to be avoided, the faults not to be committed, or the precepts which must be observed. It certainly compiles a reasoned catalogue of sins in their horrible varieties, but it is above all else, the "*Scientia virtutum*"—the science of the virtues, acquired or infused, which the Christian is bound to exercise. This seems to have been overlooked by some of the many moralists who have not only adopted the idea of dividing their treatises according to the Commandments and Contrary Sins, but have restrained unduly the treatment

of the virtues, even to the point of dismissing in a few pages some of the most important of them. The Gifts of the Holy Ghost—supplying as they do what is lacking in our natural strivings after virtue, whether moral or theological, in their perfection guided by halting prudence—find no place in their manuals. The oft-repeated excuse that these things belong to the province of mysticism and asceticism, is of no value whatever. To advance such an excuse is merely to reveal that it has been forgotten that asceticism and mysticism belong to Moral Theology in the widest sense of the term. When they are considered separately, it is especially for pedagogical reasons. If it should happen that this distinction be exaggerated in practice, and for one reason or another, a special course in ascetic theology be omitted, then we find the Science of Morals relegated to being the Science of Sins, and assuming a character which is entirely negative.

The painful experience of the pastoral ministry revealing the sins—alas, too manifest!—of negligent Christians, or of those who have completely forgotten their duty; the great number of souls unfortunately outside the direct influence of Christian Morality; the contamination of false doctrine and the danger of independent morality—all these combine to force on the pastors of souls the tendency to over-emphasize the negative, prohibitive aspect of moral instruction. In their apostolic zeal to denounce sin, to correct abuses, to shield their flock from evil, and in order, as it is sometimes put, to be “more practical,” pastors of souls only too often confine themselves to the reclaiming of sinners, the condemnation of sin, the incessant repetition of those divine precepts dealing with the evils to be avoided. “Let us heal,” they say, “let us at least try to heal the deeper wounds before attempting to preach a higher spirituality or a greater progress in the ways of God.” But action prompted by such reasoning leads them into many pitfalls. Undoubtedly there is a danger in speaking exclusively and prematurely about higher spirituality to souls who are still immersed in habits of grave sin, but there is greater danger still in giving the impression that religion consists mainly of a code of austere rules, which restrain initiative and prevent the development of life. Nothing tends to intensify this impression more than what we call “negative”



preaching, which presents no scope and offers no inspiration to the soul, with the result that it is likely to depress rather than to be profitable. Admittedly, nothing is to be gained by silence. We must speak about the sins which are committed, about the scandals that arise, and about abuses which prevail in our midst. "Argue, obsecra, increpa," wrote St. Paul to Timothy. But, on the other hand, if evil is to be successfully conquered, holiness must be made palatable and attractive for the faithful; they must be made to realize the richness and splendour of the Christian's daily life, the "*investigabiles divitias gratiae Christi*." They must participate in the divine nature, in the divine life, which grace essentially is. Among the virtues special attention should be given to the Theological Virtues which unite us directly to God, and in particular Charity, the queen, the life, the form of all the others. When speaking of the commandments, the first and greatest must be explained and dwelt upon: "Thou shalt love the Lord thy God, with thy whole heart, and with thy whole soul, and with thy whole mind."

In the way of proof, we advance the example of Our Divine Lord Himself. If He reiterated again and again, that this was "the first commandment," "the greatest," that it contained the law and the prophets, it was largely that His apostles and priests might imitate Him in their preaching. And surely it is decidedly remarkable that St. Paul in his effort to wean the new Christians from the most depraved and gravest vices of paganism took care to recall to their minds the mystery of salvation, the basic, positive duty, the imitation of God and Jesus Christ. He urges them to become "like Jesus," in fact to substitute His life for their own. He emphasizes the infinitely generous love of Jesus, which cries out for, and is satisfied only with, our love in return. From a veritable wealth of texts, I quote but one: "*Estote imitatores Dei, sicut filii carissimi, et ambulate in dilectione, sicut et Christus dilexit nos, et tradidit semetipsum pro nobis oblationem et hostiam Deo in odorem suavitatis. Fornicatio autem et omnis immunditia aut avaritia nec nominetur in vobis, sicut decet sanctos; aut turpitudine aut stultiloquium aut scurrilitas, quae ad rem non pertinet. . . .*" (Eph. v, 1 sqq).



Even a cursory reading shows the significant sequence of these verses, revealing a characteristic that is to be found in all the Pauline Epistles. Love for the Divine Law-Giver is the most effective motive for obeying His commandments and for observing His prohibitions. Then there is that delightful idea, so rarely stressed or even mentioned in the pulpit: God gives us His commandments *precisely because He loves us*, and wants us to live His life, to follow the way which *His love* has marked out for us. Love alone is capable of prompting true obedience. That fear which the psalmist tells us is the beginning of wisdom—not its plenitude—cannot restrain us at least permanently. It soon disappears from the soul in which love does not flourish. But where there is an abiding and growing love, there is a corresponding increase of fear—that is, however, *filial fear*, for it is only servile fear that is incompatible with love that is genuine and worthy of the name. The direct relation between obedience and charity—so manifest in our duty to obey God's commandments—which were given to us through love—is so insisted on by Our Divine Lord that it is nothing short of tragic if we do not give it primary consideration in our preaching. "If any man love Me, he will keep My word. . . . He that loveth Me not, keepeth not My words" (John xiv, 23-24). Cajetan shows a very complete and perfect comprehension of the close connection between obedience and charity, and expresses it admirably when he calls it the "inseparable daughter of charity."<sup>2</sup> Before him, Saint Catherine of Siena gave expression to the same idea when she said that "charity nourishes with her milk the virtue of obedience as well as patience."<sup>3</sup>

It is certain that we shall achieve nothing great if we do not inculcate love for God, the Author of the moral law, and love for Jesus Christ, Who has made known to us the commandments of the Father. We ought then, to take it as a fundamental and guiding principle that the first commandment, and the second which is "like to it," should get the first place, to which they have an indisputable right. Undoubtedly it would be hoping for too much, to expect a manifest universal

<sup>2</sup> ". . . Obedientia filia ponitur caritatis individua" (In II-IIae., q. 104, a. 4).

<sup>3</sup> Cf. *Dialogues. Obedience*, Chapter I.

improvement following at once the adoption of the system of preaching which we have recommended in which charity has its rightful place, for there are those who are hard of heart, rebels against love itself. For such as these, the preaching of love will be as sterile as the preaching of the negative duties which love requires us to fulfil and gives us the strength to accomplish. On the other hand, when souls are filled with the love of God, it is sufficient to remind them of the duties which they ought to fulfil through love. Such a reminder will have the force of a strong appeal to their charity, though in our opinion one cannot do better than to express the value of this virtue as a motive. Those who are hard of heart, are in dire need of hearing this motive, and if it does not appeal to them, *a fortiori* they will remain untouched by all others. Saint Augustine used to say: "dilige et quod vis fac." "Love and do what you please." The effect of love is to make our very own the loving commandments of Our Heavenly Father. This unity of wills, "idem velle, idem nolle," is itself the very law of love. To obey God, then, even when His Will is most exacting, and to do one's own will, are precisely the same, since now one wishes only what God wills and all that He wills. The heart vivified by love itself is a law unto itself. It is because they have not understood that this is the very essence of Christian morality, that certain philosophers have accused Christianity and Christians of being spiritually mercenary. They maintain that our actions are prompted by the fear of punishment and the hope of reward. The true Christian, however, acts, exercises self-control, abstains, works, struggles and suffers, *because he loves*. He knows full well that good works, mortification and sufferings owe their value to love alone. He knows also, that the same external works can have very different merits according to the charity that inspires them. He knows with St. John of the Cross, that "at the end of this life we shall be judged by our love," because "we were created only for this love."

There is no moral truth which it is so necessary to inculcate when we preach to the faithful, and, especially, when we instruct them in the confessional, for it is here that instruction assumes a personal character, varying in matter and in form, according to the needs of the individual soul.

It is beyond the scope of the present article to explain even summarily the duties of the confessor, which are at the same time serious and delicate. It will be sufficient for our purpose to draw the attention of our readers to a point of decided importance, and to apply the principles already stated, on the rightful place of charity in moral education to the instruction and direction of the individual soul in the privacy of the confessional. Every zealous and experienced confessor laments the weakness of sinners, and the relapses, frequent and recurrent which he has occasion to check and correct in certain penitents. Every confessor, again, finds himself, at one time or another, in the sad situation of being obliged to deny absolution to those who come to confession with dispositions which are manifestly bad, "impenitent penitents"; or at least forced to give absolution only "sub conditione," because the penitents, having relapsed repeatedly, even a short time after absolution, there is good reason to believe that the resolution which they make, "hic et nunc," is wanting in true sincerity. How many a priest has asked himself with a certain uneasiness and anxiety whether among those who do nothing more than satisfy their precept of annual confession and Paschal Communion, there are not many who lack the dispositions indispensable for the forgiveness of their sins! Undoubtedly, in these cases, there is often reason to fear that the annual confession is nothing more than a mere formality, gone through without effort or sincerity, and worse than useless in its effects.

We may mention in passing, that the unfortunate Catholics who are given to this practice, furnish a pretext for those who are ever ready to accuse the Church of being satisfied with a merely external worship, and of claiming for her sacraments a magic effect. Penitents who go through this annual formality seem to imagine that the confessor is an automatic distributor of absolution; that it is sufficient to say: "Here are my sins, rid me of them." Such is their concept of efficacy, "ex opere operato." Would it be an exaggeration to say that we priests are to a certain extent responsible for this "Formalism," this particular Phariseeism of bad Catholics, in the sense that profitable results would follow

\* Cfr. *Ami du Clergé*—13-11-30; No. 46, Page 721.

if we took advantage of our opportunities—by better and more frequent instructions on penance, by exhortations in the confessional, by emphasizing the opposition of sin to friendship with God, by explaining the essential and important part which the love of God has in every conversion that is really such and by insisting, in season and out of season, that there can be no question of remission of sin without the supernatural love of God above all else? Sin is, primarily, a denial of love to God: it is a refusal to love God above all; a choosing of a miserable created thing in preference to God Himself. The majority of sinners commit their evil deeds, not precisely because they bear Him hatred, but simply because they want to do their own will, in spite of the fact that it is opposed to the Will of God. Rather than positive hatred of God, it is *refusal of love*, or of the obedience which is demanded by love. Nevertheless, this refusal of love contains implicitly and obscurely—a desire that God should not exist, or that He be not the Dispenser of punishment for human actions. Sin tends to deprive God of His Sovereign Goodness, just as speculative errors tend of their nature to deprive Him of His very Supremacy.

There is then, in every sin, an element of malice and hatred; it is impossible to conceive sin without a certain basis of hatred—at least that of the tempter or the devil, if not of the sinner himself, just as no act is thoroughly virtuous, unless it be prompted by charity. The conduct of the sinner leads to an interior attitude which if formulated as a prayer, would contradict word for word that prayer in which Jesus teaches us to express according to the proper order of charity, all the desires of love. "Our Father who art in heaven, would that Thy name be not hallowed, that Thy Kingdom come not, that Thy Will be not done on earth as it is in heaven. Give us this day our daily bread—that is, all that we need to continue our will in opposition to Thine. Forgive us our sins and punish them not. Allow us to fall before temptation into those sins which please us. Deliver us from the evil with which Thou threatenest, and from all evil, except the real evil, the sins which we commit." Sin is opposed to the conservation in us of the divine life, and of charity. In this it is "mortal" for us.

To return to what we have said about conversion;

there can be no pardon, even with absolution, for this supposed conversion of heart—unless there is a real change; God must once again be preferred to the creature and to sin; the soul in so far as it lies in its power, must acknowledge God's supreme dominion by a love which is "*appretiative summa*," by a conversion which disavows and repairs the malice included in every grave sin. This is a point of doctrine which is certainly of immense importance, and which is scarcely insisted upon sufficiently in the catechism class, in the pulpit and in the confessional. Undoubtedly, too much must not be expected—much less demanded—from penitents. It would be wrong and even heretical to imitate the practice of the Jansenists and to require before absolution, not merely the assurance of real sorrow but a contrition the certainty of which must be established by a long penance and lasting fidelity. Almost the same criticism would be due to a confessor who would insist on perfect contrition, or charity, properly so-called. It is impossible to make an act of charity without receiving that charity which is infused with sanctifying grace, and if penance pre-supposed the life of grace, it would no longer be a sacrament of the dead, instituted primarily to restore the life of the soul that has lost it. It would be ranked among the sacraments of the living.

It would be heresy to condemn as bad and increasing the guilt of the sinner, imperfect contrition or attrition, which is inspired solely by the inferior supernatural motives. The Church has expressly defined this against Luther at the Council of Trent.<sup>5</sup> But it would, we think, be stretching the decision of the Council and going beyond the truth, to say that these motives are *sufficient for attrition* in the sense asserted by the "Attritionists." For the Council was careful to indicate by repeated allusions, the part of charity or love, as well as the fear of hell, in the work of Justification.<sup>6</sup> On this point we are convinced that the true teaching is perfectly expressed in the doctrine so well developed by Père Perinelle in his work on "Attrition According to the Council of Trent and the Teaching of St. Thomas Aquinas." This doctrine of the need for love in attrition represents perfectly the mind of St. Thomas, and has never been

<sup>5</sup> Denzinger, Nos. 897-898, 915.

<sup>6</sup> Ibid., Nos. 798, 813.



without witnesses in the Thomist school. After Bossuet and with more perfection, Hennequier and Billuart especially were its great champions up to the eighteenth century, and they have in our opinion discovered the only "via media" between the excessive liberalism of the "Attritionists" (who hold that mere fear is sufficient for attrition) and the rigid thesis of the "Contritionists," who teach that as a "*sine qua non*" condition for absolution, the penitent must have perfect contrition, and charity properly so-called. It has to be noted that there is not an essential difference, but only one of degree, between the repentance of love to which God grants justification before the reception of the sacrament, and that which is required as preparation for absolution. When the love is sufficiently intense, God justifies immediately: when such a soul receives absolution, an increase of life is given, penance in this case acting as a sacrament of the living. If, on the other hand, the love is weak, but real and genuine, the effective reception of the sacrament is indispensable for pardon and justification, but in no case can there be remission of sin without the *amor benevolentiae*. We need not be surprised that intense and fervent love is necessary for justification outside the sacrament of penance. The soul that is justified, although it merits by every act of charity, no matter how feeble, an increase of grace, receives a new degree only after fervent acts, to elicit which she brings all her energies to bear. This being so, we can readily understand that for a transition from the state of sin to that of justice, outside sacramental absolution, God demands a certain intensity of fervour in the act of love, this special "*amor charitatis*." It is quite otherwise in the Sacrament of Penance, which is instituted precisely to facilitate the reconciliation of sinners. In this sacrament no special fervour is required, although the greatest possible fervour is desirable. It is sufficient, and, of course, absolutely necessary, that the soul have in substance, "*amor appetitiue summus*."

If we are not greatly mistaken, this doctrine is of capital importance in practice, and it cannot be inculcated with too much earnestness. If the priest is really persuaded of the necessity of love for every conversion, he will constantly insist on teaching it in pulpit and confessional; and since the heart of the baptized person is made and destined for the love of God, this love, which



is so necessary, will be more frequently found, and penitents who otherwise might not acquire it, will make it their firm purpose to do so. Another good result is that the efficacy of the absolution will be made more certain, and the effect of the sacrament more lasting. Souls will be better fortified against relapses into sin, for it is well known that love succeeds where fear alone is not efficacious. It is more surely triumphant in face of the immediate attraction of created things.

It is then obvious that all roads lead us to the first commandment, to the necessity of preaching it, and reiterating it again and again.

The conclusion for the pastor of souls is no less obvious: by an appeal to love, to excite in souls sorrow for their sins, and encouragement to avoid them in future and to choose the path of virtue. Too rarely do we present to them that charity of which they are the object on God's part; too often have we been blind to the wisdom of presenting to their generosity the debt of love which they are bound to pay. To every soul ought we address—with expression to suit its state and its needs—“*Caritas Christi urget te.*” We should try to make them grasp what Pascal so fully understood: “*J’ai versé telle goutte de sang pour toi.*”

Now it may be objected that it is chimerical to try and urge souls to obey the divine law by love, that the process is rather the opposite—first secure obedience, and advance from obedience to charity. To this we would answer that the real chimera consists in thinking that it is possible to ensure obedience from those who have not yet learned to love, and it is no less impossible to have the practice of the virtues without charity. It is for this reason that Saint Francis de Sales insists so much on what one might aptly describe as the “asceticism of love”; and for the same reason a still higher authority, the apostle Saint Paul added to his other recommendations: “*Super autem omnia haec, caritatem habete, quod est vinculum perfectionis*” (Col. iii, 13).

## HOMILETICS

BY THE REV. C. C. MARTINDALE, S.J.

*Seventh Sunday after Pentecost (July 3rd).*

*Gospel. Matthew vii.*

This gospel seems at first sight almost brutally clear. Judge people, not by what they say, but what they do. "Beware of false prophets, who come to you dressed like sheep, but underneath, they are savage wolves. By their fruits you shall recognize them! A bad ('rotten') tree cannot produce sound fruit; nor a sound tree, rotten fruit. What is rotten, must produce putrid results; healthy stuff produces wholesome stuff. (Still less would you expect to pick grapes off brambles; figs, off thistles.) A tree that produces no good fruit, shall be cut down and burned. Yes. Judge them by their fruit. Not he, who says to me 'Lord—Lord,' shall enter into the kingdom of the heavens, but he only who does the will of My Father, who is in the heavens."

In this sort of page, it would be out of place to examine the differences between St. Matthew and St. Luke who put some of these sentences in different contexts. Nor is it, I think, in place to examine just how far Our Lord was alluding directly to the contemporary Jewish authorities, the Pharisees especially; nor, finally, the following words, for, the gospel, as read, stops short in the middle of a continuous flow of Our Lord's words, as so often. One of the difficulties in explaining the Sunday gospels (let alone the epistles) consists in their stopping short in the middle of some argument, if not actually of some sentence.

Perhaps I may leave to one side the rather academic consideration, which has worried many, it appears, concerned with Predestination. "If I *am* a bramble, who could expect me to produce good grapes? Thorn I am—thorns I must produce." "Vine I *am*: grapes I must produce." We all know that this sort of fatalism is false alike to human nature and to God.

The real point is, that very plausible persons give themselves out as "*prophets*," that is, as people who forthtell to the masses what is True, and what is Good. They are wrong: but they are plausible. You cannot easily judge at the moment: but you will be able to do so, if you see what their doctrine issues into. "How absurd to suppose that incompatible temperaments should remain married. How outrageous to demand that if they separate they should form no new union." "How shocking that Defectives should be allowed to mate and

reproduce." "How ridiculous, if someone doomed to die in agony, should not be allowed to commit a discreet suicide—should not be legitimately put out of the way by a kindly doctor, or a tortured onlooker." "How sure you are to create a 'complex,' if you resist your instinct." "The salvation of the world lies in—territorial communism: sexual experimentalism: economic adjustment." "Prophets" of all these systems (and of many more) actually offer themselves as Interpreters of Christ, whose true doctrine has been overlaid by a Byzantine ecclesiasticism, a mediæval sacramentalism, and who knows what!

But, says Our Lord (really almost like Kant, who—I think—asked that a moral dictate should be judged by the norm—What would happen if everyone acted like that?), see what happens on the whole. If you generalize Divorce as legitimate when the exceptional instance seems to demand it: if you turn "hard cases" into material for legislation: if you make the Personal Excuse mean the same as the Universal Reason. . . . The whole of human society will be disrupted; not to mention, GOD offended.

No. Examine (i) whether the very plausible non-Catholic doctrine really is much the same as, or better than, Catholic doctrine *in the long run*; and (ii) whether you yourselves are not rendering lip-service to God—calling yourselves Catholic; coming to Mass; receiving your annual Communion—and at the same time denying Christ and His Church in the backs of your minds—scorning poor people, or uneducated people, or people not of your nationality or race: or actually drawing a line between what a Catholic theoretically ought to do, and what (in the circumstances) he can't help doing. . . . What are the results of your Faith in your life?

(There is no space for examining the problem set by those who are *not* Catholics, but who *are* better-behaved than many a labelled—nay, than a quite genuine—"Catholic.")

*Eighth Sunday after Pentecost (July 8th).*

*Gospel. Luke xvi.*

Everyone knows that the gospel for this Sunday is problematical (Luke xvi.). It consists of the extremely vivid and human story of the agent who could not explain his management, who was dismissed, who cooked his accounts, was detected, and yet was told that he was commendable, for, he had acted cleverly! It is essential to remember that this is a parable, not an allegory. Two situations are massively (not in accurate detail) set confronting one another. The man cheated—but his cheating was apparently rather in that he had charged too high a price for certain commodities, and then, put his creditors back to a reasonable sum, than that he had charged a reasonable sum to begin with, and then, told his creditors to pay only a fraction of what was really due. Anyway, the man cheated.

His master found it out, but acknowledged that he had acted "prudently"—that is, with foresight; cleverly: not "wisely"; not "legitimately." (Of course, "the lord" is not *Our Lord*, but the "boss" who figures in the story.)

Now what is the meaning of the words beginning: "And the Master praised that immoral agent, because he acted cleverly"? or "shrewdly"? What exactly had the agent done? He had sold certain amounts of oil, grain and so on to poorer persons who had immediate need of them but could not pay immediately, and had given their "I.O.U.'s." "Sit down at once and make a new I.O.U.," says the agent: it would have been no good to alter the old document, as a *number* of changes on such papers would soon enough arouse suspicion, and, in fact, the landlord guessed what had happened even as it was. The little word "swiftly," whether you take it with "sit down" or with "write," or both—"Hurry up! no time to lose! Here! Sit down. Write 50" . . . is so vivid and unconsciously dramatic that to me it really is a symptom of the sincerity of Luke and the pleasure he took in writing!

Thus the agent felt that his accomplices would be sure to give him at least an interim shelter. . . . All the same, the landlord *did* guess, and you practically hear him cry out: "You clever rascal! Really dishonest people are cleverer at their job than honest men are!" Thus I think that those words are primarily to be placed upon the lips of the landlord; but *also*, form a sort of bridge to Our Lord's own comment, and that His thought was as it were injecting itself into them as He spoke them. What he really urges is: "As for Me, I bid you make yourselves, too, friends—friends who shall receive you into an everlasting home!" But the words of the parable as it were overlap into His lesson: the landlord had spoken to the "steward of injustice," that is, simply, "the wicked steward"; and Our Lord says: "make friends out of the mammon of injustice," i.e., by means of wicked money. Usually you find that interpreted as if it was just "money"; i.e., give alms and do good, and so you will gain merit. But the word "unjust" enters emphatically in. Now I think that the parable had seemed to the rather harsh sense of humour of Our Lord's Jewish listeners definitely *amusing*: they liked seeing *cleverness* "caught out"; I think they were all smiling. And I think that Our Lord, smiling too, but very gravely, *either* said: "Well . . . the landlord was right in a sense. Use that terribly dangerous thing, money—money, which is so mixed up as a rule with sin—in the *right* way, so as to make friends for, and in, eternity." *Or else*, I think He spoke with terrible irony: "Ah—steal, cheat . . . use your ill-gotten money to make friends with men who shall receive you into—*eternal* homes . . ." knowing well, and knowing that His hearers knew, that there is nothing less lasting than friendships made through sin. I think that the ending to this section of the discourse quite well bears that interpretation: I know that some hold Our Lord

"could not have used irony"; it seems to them "beneath" Him: I could not admit that. Irony is not sarcasm; and many of the parables and even separate *logia* are ironical enough; for instance, the tale of the Importunate Widow; and, "Go tell *that* fox. . . ."

*Ninth Sunday after Pentecost (July 17th).*

*Gospel. Luke xix.*

This gospel begins with a direct prophecy of the siege and sack of Jerusalem, and ends with the account of Our Lord's turning the traffickers out of the Temple. However, the words: "the time of thy visitation," and "but now they are hid from thine eyes," have deep significance. There were things that "belonged to" the peace of the City: Jerusalem *could* have seen what they were, and have sought them: but now she cannot so much as see—her state is hopeless; she is doomed. She had not noticed that God was "visiting" her: God's "visitation" is a very familiar expression in the Scriptures, and it means the special approach of God by no means only in wrath (though if often means that), but in love or mercy, or in any way implied by a *special* "approach" of Him who is always present.

There is no such thing as fatalism; but there is, so to say, a sort of "moral" doom brought about by the progressive silencing of the conscience, dulling of the spiritual edge, hardening of the heart, thinning out sheer perceptiveness by frivolity, a self-blinding to the very meaning of divine things. "Your word 'God' simply doesn't mean anything to me." St. Paul speaks of the *cauterized* soul. Even the pagan who has let himself become identified with *wrong*, not only becomes less and less able to see what is true and right, but becomes (after committing the whole catalogue of positive crimes) "ἀσύνετοι, ἀσύνθετοι, ἀστοργοί, ἀνελεήμονες"—"without intuition, without power of harmonizing [Vg., *incompositi*: this assumes that the word means—Helpless to create an interior harmony; restless; self-contradictory: no doubt, that is true; but these words look outwards, and I think it means that the absolutely selfish man has become unable to fuse in any way with his fellow-sinners, nay, even with ordinary society], without affection, without feeling." (We are accustomed to the *sentimentalism* often to be found in extremely "hard" men of business: but some have thought they notice in our very paganized generation an unwonted hardness even in girls—perhaps especially in them. They won't have sentimentality, and they lose the very power of sentiment.)

We very often preach about sins: sin A, sin B, each of which must be repented and confessed: but it might be wise to reflect on and speak of the interior general change in the entire character, the stuff of the man, the whole quality of his mind, which underlies his actions (good or bad). You can quite well

watch a man deteriorating, when he is *not* committing any exteriorly wrong acts, and cannot test or in any way gauge his own deterioration. The Jerusalem of the soul can become, therefore, morally unable to recognize God or the advent of His graces and inspirations.

*Tenth Sunday after Pentecost (July 24th).*

*Gospel. Luke xviii.*

This gospel consists wholly of the parable of the Pharisee and the Publican. (The tiny syllable *up* in the phrase "went up to the Temple" to pray, is another detail that delights one: St. Luke uses it unconsciously; yet it is *right*: you did have to climb the whole flights of steps to get there. A writer who had not the actual scene "at the back of his mind" would probably have said just: "Went *into* the Temple. . . ." There is also a subtle difference in the words by which each personage is described as "standing." The Pharisee "*σταθεῖς*," stands himself up stiffly—after all, standing was the normal attitude for prayer; but there is a nuance of "stuck-up-ness" about the word, in comparison with "*ἑστώς*"—the Publican remains standing near the door; he daren't come forward. . . .)

Now Our Lord concludes that the Publican went home "in a state of righteousness" (the tense is the perfect: it is not as though Our Lord had said: "Absolved," a separate definite act) *rather than* the Pharisee. Apparently the Pharisee told nothing but the truth, and a very remarkable truth! He did *not* commit grave sins: he did much that was extra—no one was obliged to fast so often, though Mondays and Thursdays became favourite fasting-days for the devout. No one was expected to give tithes on *all* that they got (I think the Pharisee says: "I give tithes from everything that I buy or acquire": *πρώμαι* means that, rather than "possess.") It does not exactly follow that the Pharisee was making a rash judgment about the Publican—perhaps he knew the Publican was a scallywag; or took it for granted that he must be, as people used to take it for granted that actors and actresses were, and thereby made it much easier, alas, for them to be so. If the Stage has improved, that is not due to any help that we have given it. (That the Pharisee had the right to judge that the Publican *was* a sinner, is suggested by the poor man's own prayer, which was not: "Be merciful to me, a sinner," but, "to me, 'the sinner'!"—the notorious wastrel—almost, nicknamed "The Sinner," just as Our Lord said to Nicodemus: "You are 'The Master in Israel,' and you don't know that?")

The Pharisee then *was* a well-behaved man, who (we, if we don't want to rash-judge him in our turn) really did mean to thank God that he was not like the Publican; but, in his imperfect mind, he was at least as pleased with himself as he was grateful to God. He went home from Mass, so to say, a universally respected citizen and knowing it: a "thoroughly



good Catholic"—and yet. . . ! All the same, as Mrs. Meynell pointed out in one of her poems, modern people are apt to plume themselves much rather on not being "even as this Pharisee": they often make themselves out to be worse "publicans" than they are. . . You get more flattery—at any rate during youth—for being a bit of a devil than for being a "saint."

We cannot, however, deny that there is much direct "Pharisaism"—not the inverted sort mentioned above—even in contemporary life where people boast of so much more wrong-doing than they are really guilty of. Of course, much of the bitter mockery of Christian hypocrisy comes from people who, knowing themselves in the wrong, like to catch professedly virtuous people out, and make so much more of the sins of Christians than they deserve. All the same, I suppose that our parishes are composed very often indeed of the "respectable," of people belonging to fairly modest walks in life, but who have worked their way "up," and desire no more to associate with the "riff-raff." One sees easily to what extent they are right in wishing to keep clear of what might coarsen their *minds*; but that is only part of their motive on the whole, and they do almost infallibly tend to "despise others." The able-seaman calls the stokers the "black dregs"; the steward sneers at the seaman; saloon stewards will not associate with the cabin ones; and the passengers call the stokers "scum" when they don't condescend to them, or feel frightened of them.

For, there is a good deal of sulky fright on both sides, especially now that Russian ideas are becoming so very common. There is, increasingly, in England not only the *fear* of going to church if one has "no clothes," but resentment for churches as places that cater for those only who *do* have them. A writer in a Catholic paper recently commented on the change of voice and phrasing that comes about, too often, the moment a priest's back is turned. I gathered that he was alluding to rich and "society" people. But the same can too well be true of very poor people. It has been a shock to me, when catching the preposterous word now popularized—*bourgeois*—upon Catholic lips, and especially when applied to, precisely, the section of the faithful who *did* go to Mass, and even to the presbytery. But in proportion as there *is* pharisaism in our people, and when a sort of ethical pharisaism is mixed and reinforced with a social one, the whole terrain is being prepared for conscious communism and apostacy.

*Eleventh Sunday after Pentecost (July 31st).*

*Gospel. Mark vii.*

Our Lord cures a man who is deaf and—hardly dumb, but with a grave impediment that made him quite unable to talk "properly" as he afterwards did. Our Lord's attempt to ensure privacy may seem curious, now that His ministry had

advanced so far: but quite possibly *just then* He was not wanting crowds—perhaps He was instructing His friends in an intimate way that would have been impossible when people were mobbing Him. It may even have been (it has seemed possible to some) in order to get that privacy that He went so strangely out of His way, to Galilee *via* Sidon. Or again, He may not have wished to make His ministry notorious in a practically pagan district, since He was not “sent,” substantially, save to the Jews. But the gospel is a good lesson in sacramentalism.

Our Lord often did things, in the course of His miracles, that contained a real element of “suggestion.” He took sick people “by the hand,” and lifted them; here, He puts His fingers into the man’s ears almost as though piercing a choked channel; and, moistening His finger, touched his tongue, as though it had grown dried and rigid; and when praying, He looks *up to Heaven*. When men, who at least call themselves Christians, mock at Catholics for their “magical” sacraments, not only are they askew as to what magic means, and what sacrament means; but, they might well remember how thoroughly “sacramental” was Our Lord’s habitual way of acting; nay, how He Himself was in a true sense “sacramental,” inasmuch as He did not save us invisibly merely, but by using His body which was no less material than ours. Seeing that we are men, of what service would a religion be to us that was *not* “anthropomorphic”—unless indeed we are prepared to say, even more truly, that created nature is theomorphic, as indeed it is.

Seeing that Our Lord’s miracles were “signs,” and intended to manifest His Messiahship as a rule, we have the right especially when He tried to work them secretly, like this one, to seek also for a spiritual significance in them: here it is obvious—we need spiritual hearing and spiritual “right” speech. There are those phrases—“he that hath ears of hearing—i.e., ears that *can* hear—*let him hear!*”; and, “that hearing they may not hear,” and so forth. How often we have heard! how the words have battered upon our ear-drums and even on the surface of our minds! And nothing has “gone in”; we have heard, but hardly have listened, and have understood but how little! Would that we could train all our teachers, who (after all) can *say* little save what they do say, first, to say it having themselves “heard” it and laid hold on its meaning and kept it with intimate conviction; and, second, to pray always for the children whom they teach, lest they in their turn do not “hear” in Our Lord’s sense; repeat their formulas; win prizes, even; and go out still without attaching any real significance to, finding any value in or love for, say, Mass. Indeed, who does not, now and again, “wake up” and feel as if he were hearing Our Lord’s words, or reading the liturgical words, for the first time! (That, perhaps, is one reason why it helps one so much to read the gospels sometimes at least in Greek. The same word, in a different language, simply leaps

out at you and lays hold of you as never before.) And, that the "strings of one's tongue" may be "loosed"! That one may not only say nothing that one does not mean, but, put the maximum of meaning into all that one says—to speak, no matter how haltingly (like the Curé d'Ars), but, unable (again like him) to *see* anything short of the *most* in what one says.

I recently had an interesting discussion with three lay members of the B.B.C.—one, an "earnest though 'modern' Anglican"; one, a very likeable scallywag, I think; and the third, religious, but a dark horse as to his special brand. They were, however, absolutely unanimous about which talks "got across" and which didn't; they united in affirming that no talk that was not "sincere" had any chance of doing so; and they made a very firm distinction between "negative sincerity"—i.e., not saying anything insincere; and, positive sincerity, which meant, *whole-heartedly* meaning *everything* *meanable* in *all* that you said. It was curious to listen to the selection of names that they made—men who were insincere; who were negatively, and who were positively sincere. They made me re-examine my own conscience. "Lord, that I may hear! Lord, that I may *see*! Lord, that I may speak 'rightly'!"

## NOTES ON RECENT WORK

### I. ASCETICAL AND MYSTICAL THEOLOGY.

By REV. J. CARTMELL, D.D., Ph.D., M.A.

#### THE CASE OF TERESA NEUMANN.

Last year Fr. Pacificus, O.M. Cap., published a short life of this stigmatic.<sup>1</sup> We have now available in English a more detailed account in the medico-psychological study of Dr. Hynek, a Czech expert.<sup>2</sup> The following short presentation of Teresa Neumann's case is based mainly on Dr. Hynek's book, but also quite extensively on a fine review article by P. Maréchal, S.J., of Louvain, in the *Nouvelle Revue Théologique* for April, 1932. P. Maréchal's article deals with three books: the large and masterly work of Dr. Gerlich, late editor of the *Münchener Neueste Nachrichten*;<sup>3</sup> Dr. Hynek's smaller and more vivacious study; and a Flemish work, theological in its viewpoint, by Kan. de Hovre.

Teresa Neumann has the stigmata in hands, feet, left side and head, with a large bruise on the right shoulder. She also bleeds from the eyes during her Passion ecstasies. She has very realistic visions of the Passion almost every Friday, and re-enacts in her person, more vividly than any actor, the whole drama of Calvary. At other times she has visions of the lives of Our Lady and of the Saints. Also, she has taken no food or drink, except the Blessed Sacrament, since September, 1927. That is, quite briefly, her present history.

Teresa's stigmata are nervous wounds, which do not suppurate and do not heal; they bleed only during her Friday ecstasies. Prolonged efforts to assign various natural causes to them have been distinctly unsuccessful. Auto-suggestion alone retains some degree of probability, because of the mysterious and truly wonderful effects that it has been known to produce. Thus, auto-suggestion has brought forth a burn blister in nine minutes and removed it with equal ease. It has induced several skin affections, ringworms, ulcers and boils. It has even caused a painful necrosis of the skin to the size of a crown. But in the opinion of Dr. Hynek and others no case is yet recorded in which auto-suggestion has been able to bring about the alteration of tissue involved in a lasting, bleeding wound. Dr. Hynek's powerful argument in this matter is that no single wound of the thousands which overwrought soldiers inflicted on themselves during the War was produced by auto-suggestion.

<sup>1</sup> Burns, Oates & Washbourne. 2s. 6d. and 1s. 6d.

<sup>2</sup> Konnersreuth, translated and adapted by Lancelot W. Sheppard. (Burns, Oates & Washbourne. 4s.)

<sup>3</sup> Die Stigmatisierte Th. Neumann von Konnersreuth (2 vols., 9 and 10 M.).

The visions of the Passion at Konnersreuth conform to the Way of the Cross now in vogue in the Church, and they differ in many details from those of Anne Catherine Emmerich and still more widely from those of other mystics. It is clear, therefore, without further argument that they are not entirely genuine. Spiritual writers have long admitted that no private revelations and visions are found without a copious parasitic growth of illusions and errors, originating partly from the mystics themselves and partly from the influence or the activity of others. The vivacious imagination of the subject sometimes clothes with reality and incorporates into her visions objects of ordinary natural knowledge, gained from reading, from religious exercises or from the teaching of preachers and directors. When the Ptolemaic system was in vogue saints occasionally saw the crystal heavens or the empyrean. The Dominican St. Catherine of Siena heard from Our Lady's own lips that she was not immaculate. In their visions of the Passion the ecstasies see Our Lord falling three times, though the event is quite uncertain historically. Again the visions are sometimes modified when reported. St. Bridget of Sweden confessed to occasional retouches to make her visions more intelligible, and the secretaries of Anne Catherine Emmerich and of Marie Lataste practised extensive remodelling.<sup>4</sup> Quite certainly then there will be many illusions in Teresa Neumann's visions; but it by no means follows that they are not substantially genuine.

Several years have elapsed since Teresa became an ecstatic, and during all that time she has been closely scrutinized and keenly discussed. The result is an accumulation of strong arguments converging to prove that her phenomena are supernatural. The arguments are drawn from the constant presence in her life of certain factors which baffle natural explanation and from the undeniably high state of holiness to which she has attained.

(1) In her visions she hears the characters speaking Aramaic. The fact is beyond question. It is substantiated by the authority of several Orientalists, Catholic and non-Catholic. Thus the well-known Dr. Bauer, Professor of Semitic Philology at Halle, writes: "The fact that it is real Aramaic is absolutely incontestable. It is Aramaic of the time of Jesus Christ." The Abbé Wutz of Eichstätt maintains that he can distinguish in it the different dialects of Caiaphas and of St. Peter. This does sound like extravagance. But Wutz is an authority, and he is risking his reputation, and anyhow it does not alter the essential fact that the language is Aramaic. Wutz is publishing a book on the whole question. Explanation of the mystery by natural causes is not forthcoming. Telepathy is excluded, because she heard the mysterious language from the beginning of her Friday visions, before the Orientalists were introduced,

<sup>4</sup> These details are taken from Tanquerey's *Précis d'Ascétique et de Mystique*, nn. 1506-1508 (in its English translation called *The Spiritual Life*).

and the experts have had sufficient sense to assume and make trial of the hypothesis of telepathy.

(2) During the state of "ecstatic repose" which follows her visions, Teresa is in close union with Our Lord and displays a truly marvellous knowledge of hidden things. She detects authentic relics and traces their origin and history, giving details which have proved true on examination. She reads the secrets of hearts. "She revealed to the Bishop (Schrembs of Cleveland) secrets of his soul which surprised him so greatly and affected him so deeply that he broke into tears. She then described to him the state of his diocese."<sup>5</sup> She has also predicted several things which have proved true in the event. Fr. Gemelli, O.F.M., the distinguished convert scientist, was commissioned by the Holy See to visit and examine Teresa. When leaving he told her that he would see the Holy Father the following Thursday. She replied that he would not obtain an audience until Saturday. To prove her wrong Fr. Gemelli tried hard to get an audience on Thursday, but he did not succeed.<sup>6</sup> It is a noteworthy characteristic of Teresa's faculty of intuition that she does not exercise it to satisfy mere curiosity, but only for the love of Our Lord and the good of souls.

(3) Teresa Neumann has maintained a total fast since September, 1927, from all food and drink except the Blessed Sacrament. From Christmas, 1926, until September, 1927, she took a spoonful of water after Holy Communion. For four years previously she had been able to assimilate only liquid food. Such progressive inability to eat is a usual symptom of neurosis and it is likely enough that neurosis would account for the oncoming of Teresa's fast from solids. But there are elements of her condition that no neurosis can explain. It is inexplicable that she should have remained alive so long without proteins and the other constituents of wholesome food. She is frail and therefore less likely to live without nourishment. The Friday ecstasies and bleedings are a great strain on her constitution. During the week, she is not bed-ridden, but goes about a little and helps others where she can, and is cheerful and spirited. All that, for five years, with only the Blessed Sacrament to nourish her! Is it susceptible of a natural explanation? Then, too, her weight remains almost constant, recovering when diminished. In July, 1927, the late Bishop of Ratisbon instituted a commission of enquiry into the alleged facts of Konnersreuth. Four Franciscan nursing sisters were set to watch the stigmatic day and night for a fortnight. They were under oath to do their full duty conscientiously. Two by two they kept her under the closest observation, never losing sight of her for an instant, and they searched, measured and weighed with German thoroughness whatever might usefully be

<sup>5</sup> Quoted from *The Message from Konnersreuth* (p. 48), a pamphlet by Rt. Rev. Sigmund Waitz, Bishop of Feldkirch, published by the Benedictine Convent of Perpetual Adoration, Clyde, Mo. Dr. Hynek in *Konnersreuth* also reports the incident (p. 101).

<sup>6</sup> Waitz, *The Message from Konnersreuth* (p. 41).



subjected to such investigation. The findings of the commission were published in the autumn. It was ascertained that Teresa's weight when the enquiry opened was fifty-five kilograms. She was down to fifty-one kilograms after her ecstasy on Friday, July 15th; had increased to fifty-four kilograms by Wednesday, July 20th; was again reduced to fifty-two and a half kilograms by Saturday, July 23rd; and was back to her original fifty-five kilograms on Thursday, July 28th. Yet she had taken during the whole fortnight only three soup-spoonfuls of water and thirty-nine grams of Host!

(4) On normal days Teresa is able to take only about the eighth part of a Host and that with great difficulty, but when she is in ecstasy she can receive a whole Host with perfect ease but apparently without swallowing. The evidence of many creditable witnesses, some of whom are distinguished ecclesiastics, attests that the senses can detect no act of deglutition. The Host is placed on her tongue, she withdraws it within her mouth and there it remains a few seconds and then suddenly disappears while her mouth is still open. This phenomenon is accompanied for the stigmatic with a vision of Christ in glory coming to her, and a sense of His presence within her for the rest of the day.

Such are the inexplicable factors of Teresa Neumann's mysterious life. "Signa demum extasis divinae ex moribus potissimum petenda sunt" (Benedict XIV). "A soul may be transported beyond herself in prayer; but if she be not habitually united to God, and elevated to the Divinity by a life superior to nature and the senses; if her conduct does not visibly display that *ecstasy of action and operation* which is accomplished by a renunciation of worldly desires, of self-will, of the inclinations of corrupt nature, and the practice of interior virtues, as humility of heart, meekness, simplicity, a constant tender charity for our neighbour, raptures serve only to attract the admiration of men." Ecstasy of body must therefore be accompanied by an "extase en sa vie"; otherwise it must not be accepted. Theologically considered such phenomena as Teresa Neumann displays are, in the main, not beyond the power of an angel to produce; therefore we must test the spirits to see if they be of God.

Now it is the unanimous testimony of all who are competent to judge that Teresa Neumann has the ecstasy of life described by St. Francis de Sales. She is simplicity itself: "simple, naturelle, franche, heureuse" is a French visitor's description of her. Father Naber, her parish priest, witnesses to the simplicity and fervour with which she prays, "like a child speaking to its father." She is humble. She dislikes the displays of which she is involuntarily the centre. She courts no popularity. With her whole family she refused a large sum of money offered to tempt her to be filmed. She regards herself

<sup>7</sup> St. Francis de Sales, *The Love of God*, Book VII, Chapter 7, quoted from Tanqueray, *The Spiritual Life*, n. 1461.

as merely a passive instrument in God's hands, accepting all, to live or to die, to be well or to be ill. She is a model of obedience. "In her ideas," says Dr. Gerlich, "obedience plays an important rôle, and thus she has always insisted on absolute submission to the ecclesiastical authorities." She is also distinguished for charity, the greatest test virtue of a true mystic. Ordinarily, she is up and about, assisting others where she can, helping especially the sick and suffering. Her love for sinners often reaches the heroic height of suffering vicariously for them. And her love is apostolic, anxiously zealous to further the interests of her "dear Saviour" and to spread the kingdom of God."

"It bears repeating that in Teresa's conversations one thing predominates: an exceedingly great love for Our Divine Saviour, unspeakable mildness and goodness, infinite longing of Our Lord for the salvation of souls and for the co-operation of priests, and finally, great joy in all sacrifices."<sup>8</sup>

"Teresa feels a longing to offer her sufferings for priests so that all priests may become animated by a true spirit and that their labours may be crowned with success. She has been instructed to offer her sufferings for priests and for the salvation of souls. Her mission is to suffer, to sacrifice herself, to die to herself, and to abnegate herself. With this intention she has dedicated herself to the Sacred Heart as a sacrificial victim."<sup>9</sup> It is not surprising, therefore, that the strikingly impressive scenes, to be witnessed at Konnersreuth, have wrought the conversion of many Protestants and Jews.

The attitude of ecclesiastical authority towards Konnersreuth is described by P. Maréchal, S.J., as "enquêtes attentives et réserve bienveillante." The late Bishop of Ratisbon gave little credence at first, but later established the commission of which we have spoken. The present Bishop, Dr. Buchberger, a distinguished scholar and editor of the *Lexicon für Theologie und Kirche*, has visited Konnersreuth since his appointment to the See. Cardinal Faulhaber of Munich has also been there, and the late Cardinal Piffl of Vienna and numerous Bishops and prominent churchmen from all parts of the world. But the Bavarian bishops have thought it wise to restrict the number of visitors by allowing only those to see the stigmatic who have a permit from the Bishop of Ratisbon. The Holy See has sent Fr. Gemelli, O.F.M., twice to investigate the case, but has issued no decision.<sup>10</sup> The Holy Father has, however, deigned to impart the apostolic blessing to the parish priest, Fr. Naber, and to the stigmatic. The most striking expression

<sup>8</sup> Waitz, *The Message from Konnersreuth*, p. 51.

<sup>9</sup> *ibid.*, p. 56.

<sup>10</sup> Quite differently from the Holy See's treatment of Padre Pio of Foggia. Dr. Hynek seems to believe in Padre Pio, and gives a curious reason for his retirement from public notice. The decision of the Holy See is quite clear: "Non constare de eorumden factorum supernaturalitate" (A.A.S. Vol. XV., p. 356), "Nihil de praetensa eorum supernaturalitate colligi potuisse" (A.A.S., Vol. XVI., p. 368). See CLERGY REVIEW, Vol. II., n. 2, p. 182.

of ecclesiastical opinion on the matter hitherto given was the sermon which Cardinal Faulhaber preached at Munich on November 6th, 1927. The Cardinal spoke guardedly, but with obvious sympathy. We quote the peroration from Dr. Hynek. "Even before a definite judgment is pronounced Konnersreuth can be for us a message of grace: men of modern times stricken with modern sorrows return to the pious veneration of the Passion of Christ and take refuge in His wounds. A child of the Fichtelgebirge, with complete resignation, becomes lost in the contemplation of the sorrows of Jesus, especially on Fridays. In compassion she sheds tears of blood and has become a living image of the Crucified . . . and this poor child, having no other instruction than what she was given in the elementary school, has nevertheless learnt to draw all her knowledge from the book of the cross. Preaching without words, but by the force of example, she has led the humanity of Europe to the foot of the cross of Christ and buried it in His wounds: thus rings out from to-day the message of Konnersreuth."<sup>11</sup>

## II. LITURGICAL ARTS AND CRAFTS.

### THE CONSTRUCTION OF THE ALTAR.

BY THE REV. J. P. REDMOND.

*Instaurare omnia in Christo*, the motto of that great reformer, Pius X, is the watchword of the widespread movement of liturgical reform which aspires to restore to the liturgy the dignified simplicity and beauty of former ages. Decadence began with the Renaissance; the worldly spirit of vainglorious pomp infected the sacred arts. The stupid artificialities of eighteenth century France completed the degradation. Vestments, ornaments and furnishings assumed fantastic shapes and ignoble decorations to the extent of obscuring their original purpose, and rendering them occasions of distraction rather than edification. With the passing of good taste, neither sufficient strength nor interest remained to withstand the invasion of the purveyor of manufactured ecclesiastical wares.

We have travelled a long way since the days when Dom Guéranger's *Année Liturgique* was the only attempt to inculcate a popular appreciation of liturgical worship. The scholarship and research of the last twenty-five years have produced a rich harvest of liturgical literature. By diffusing knowledge the movement of reform has awakened a new interest; by defining the principles of sacred art and by drawing attention to the inspiring records of the past, it has stimulated a healthy dissatisfaction with the base standards of commercialized art, and a *zelus domui*, a keenness to make beautiful and becoming the house of God and everything pertaining to the service of His altar. In recent publications there is a marked tendency to reduce the results of these years of hard work to terms of practical value. This is exemplified in the following list:

<sup>11</sup> *Konnersreuth*, p. 135-6.

*Vestments and Vesture*, by Dom Roulin, O.S.B., a delightful book which has been received with well deserved enthusiasm; *Liturgia*, *Encyclopédie Populaire Des Connaissances Liturgiques*, an omnibus volume compiled by a committee of expert collaborators, published by the enterprising house of Bloud et Gay; *La Prière et La Vie Liturgiques*, an excellent series of brochures by competent writers, covering a vast field of liturgical information; *Peregrinus Goes Abroad*, by Rev. M. A. Chapman, an amusing work which, despite the fictional form and colloquial style, is full of sound advice; and, lately, the first two numbers of an exquisitely beautiful, and at the same time distinctly informative, American production entitled *Liturgical Arts*.

A subject of particular interest to the clergy, the construction of the altar in accordance with the principles of liturgy and art, has been well treated in the pages of these volumes. The altar is unquestionably the most important appurtenance of a church; it stands for the Sacrifice and the Presence. A church is built to enshrine the altar, but too often, it would seem, church-builders regard the altar as a minor incidental which may be neglected indefinitely, whilst expensive attention is lavished upon features and furnishings more satisfying to the whims of the architect or benefactor. In submitting the following summary of the findings of experts our intention is not to harass those whose altars have been ill-constructed, but to guide such as may have to construct in the future.

It may be worth while to mention that *Liturgia* includes a fine section on the history of the altar, by Canon A. Frézet of Rheims. The subject has a fascination of its own, and a few indications may be of interest.

The word altar is a compound of *alta* and *ara*. The *altare*, or *ara alta*, of pagan Rome was a monumental structure erected for public sacrifice, whereas the *ara* was a small domestic shrine. The Christians adopted the term *altare* as being appropriate to the Sacrifice of the New Law, but excluded the term *ara* by reason of its distinctively pagan significance. Even so, some of the patristic writings show a preference for the expression, *mensa Domini*. The first representation of a Christian altar appears in a fresco of the second century, discovered in 1893. This altar is simply a semi-circular table of small dimensions. The stone altar came into use by force of circumstances; when persecution drove the Christians into the catacombs, the sepulchral chambers were turned into chapels, and the principal tomb conveniently took the place of the table. From these beginnings developed the definitive type of altar, combining the ideas of a table and a tomb. The Renaissance produced a new style in the shape of a stone slab resting upon a marble urn.

Wooden altars remained in use in England, despite a prohibiting decree dating from 517, as late as the eleventh century. The altar of the Lateran Basilica is actually the only surviving testimony to the primitive custom of using wooden altars. Many curious examples of ancient stone altars have been preserved, some still in use, some in archæological museums;

most of them are of remarkably small dimensions. The retable, *retro tabula*, came into use at the beginning of the eleventh century. Originally the retable was a representation of a sacred scene, in sculptured stone or painted wood, which could be adjusted to the simple altar to add solemnity on greater feasts. Such ornaments were costly, and for a long period their usage was confined chiefly to cathedrals and great abbeys. The introduction of the retable led to an interesting development in opposite directions. It suggested the fixed gradine for small churches, and the sumptuous reredos for the greater.

In the opinion of not a few liturgical authorities the coming of the reredos was a misfortune rather than an advance; in their estimate it would have been better if the scheme of graceful hangings, almost universally used in early mediæval churches, had been continued. The altar should be the focal point of a church. A reredos crowded with statues or pictures can easily be a source of distraction. It must be admitted that however admirable and venerable some of the famous specimens may be as works of art, the Van Eyck at Ghent, for example, the subjects are hardly suitable to have before the eyes during the offering of the Holy Sacrifice. In short, the accessory became more prominent than the all-important object which it was intended to decorate. With reference to the reredos, both in ancient and modern usage, the late Mr. Edmund Bishop complained that whereas formerly the idea that determined everything was that of the altar of God only, now it is the senses of the spectator and the impression that the architect wishes to make upon him.

During the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries the reredos, following the tendencies of the period, degenerated into a pseudo-classical construction of marble serving as a frame for a statue or a picture of indifferent quality.

#### THE LITURGICAL CONSTRUCTION OF THE ALTAR.

The guiding authorities in this matter are the twentieth chapter of the General Rubrics of the Missal, the Codex Juris Canonici, Titulus XI, the Rituale Romanum, the Caeremoniale Episcoporum, decisions of the Sacred Congregation of Rites. The subject is also affected by Canon 1164 of the Code, which prescribes that in the building and restoration of churches the Ordinaries should see that the forms received from Christian tradition and the laws of sacred art are observed.

The all-important twentieth chapter is worth quoting in full: "The altar, on which the most Holy Sacrifice of the Mass is to be celebrated, should be of stone and consecrated by a Bishop (or by an Abbot having faculties from the Apostolic See); or at least there should be a stone insertion large enough to support the Host and the greater part of the base of the chalice, likewise consecrated by a Bishop (or Abbot as above). This altar should be covered with three cloths, or clean coverings, blessed by a Bishop or some other person having authority, the upper being at least long enough to reach the ground at the ends, the other



two shorter, or consisting of one cloth folded double. The altar, moreover, should be adorned with a frontal (*pallium*) of the colour suitable to the feast or office, in so far as that is possible. On the altar should be placed a crucifix, in the middle, and at least two candlesticks containing candles on either side. At the foot of the cross should be placed the canon (*Tabella Secretarum*); on the Epistle corner, the cushion for the support of the missal, and at the same Epistle side the wax candle to be lighted at the elevation of the Sacrament. A small bell, small glass cruets for wine and water, together with a small dish and a clean towel should be prepared in a niche or on a small table. On the altar nothing whatsoever should be placed which does not pertain to its own adornment or to the Sacrifice of the Mass."

It will be seen from this, as from all other legislation on the subject, that according to the mind of the Church, the altar should be invested with two prime qualities, permanence and dignity.

For our present purpose we may dismiss the distinction between fixed and portable altars, and confine our attention to the former. The mensa of the fixed altar should have a highly polished surface engraven with five Greek crosses, one at each corner, about six inches from the edge, and one in the centre. Gradines are not necessary, and one only is permitted. The support (*stipes*) of the altar may consist of four or more stone columns, of an intact stone, or of a solid mass of masonry. If the space between the columns is left open, on no account must it be used as a place of storage. The sepulchrum must be a hollow in the stone. A choice of three positions is allowed: in the top of the stone base so that the mensa itself serves as a cover; in the front or back of the base, midway between the mensa and the predella; in the mensa itself near the front edge. Excepting when placed in the first position, it must be sealed with a stone fitting exactly and marked back and front with a cross. There should be a predella of at least one step; an altar which is to be used for solemn functions should be raised to the height of three steps, but not more.

#### ALTAR FURNISHINGS.

The Crucifix must be large and prominent, and, whatever the material, should be in keeping with the design and colour of the candlesticks. It may be set upon the mensa or in a reredos; it may be suspended from above, or may be a fixture rising from the dome of the tabernacle; but a flat-topped tabernacle may never be used as a pedestal.

Altar Cloths must be of linen or hemp; they should not be pleated, neither should they be decorated in any way; lace-edging should be eschewed, as being trivial, effeminate, and inconsistent with the monumental character of the altar. A Tabernacle should be present only when reservation is intended; it should stand upon the mensa or upon the gradine, and should



be free all round so that it may be completely covered by the veil. The position on the mensa is preferred, and the gradine can be divided so as to allow the tabernacle to stand between two sections. A white veil is always correct, but it is desirable that the colour of the feast or season should be followed. A simple veil of plain silk relieved by an edging of gold or colour, produces the best effect. Veils of satin covered with painted figures are an abomination. The veil is a more important and surer sign of the Presence than the sanctuary lamp. The popular belief that a handsome door dispenses from its use, is erroneous, and the substitution of narrow strips of transparent lace is an unworthy subterfuge.

The frontal, though strongly recommended, is not of strict obligation. An altar-base which is a genuine work of art may be left uncovered, or a frontlet, a short coloured hanging from the edge of the mensa, may be used. A frontal of rich material, or one richly but suitably embroidered, is more sightly and effective than an altar-front of cheap plaster figures turned out by the manufacturer's moulds. In general, it is a bad principle to copy a work of art into a medium different from the original; yet one frequently sees altar-fronts of cast plaster representations of Leonardo's Last Supper.

A carpet, preferably red or green, should cover the predella and the middle of the steps, but there is no point in covering up a sanctuary floor which is a beautiful piece of work in itself.

Over the altar must be suspended a covering broad enough to extend over both mensa and predella. This is not a matter of choice, but of obligation insisted upon by many decisions of the Sacred Congregation of Rites. It may be objected that such a covering is found wanting in many well-known churches. Those responsible may be excused on the plea of local custom, or on the presumption, again erroneous, that a dome or well-conditioned roof is sufficient. Three types of covering are recognized: the ciborium, a massive stone erection of monumental dignity; the canopy or baldachino, a construction of cloth or wood, supported by four posts; the tester, a construction similar to the canopy, but not supported by posts. A revival, or more widespread use, of the graceful mediæval arrangement of tester, dorsal, hangings and riddel-posts, is advocated by many modern enthusiasts for correct liturgical art, including Dom Roulin and the contributors to *Liturgical Arts*. Anyone who has seen this charming arrangement which invests the sanctuary with wonderful dignity and solemnity, which at the same time has the advantage of being not too costly, will have no further use for those pretentious confections of wood and plaster, which have been foisted on to us by the manufacturer. The scheme is in use most effectively at Holy Cross Priory Church, Leicester, and at Buckfast Abbey. The first issue of *Liturgical Arts* contains an admirable series of coloured designs which reveal how beautifully the arrangement can be adapted to the requirements of small churches.

## MORAL CASES

### CANONICAL FORMULAE.

Does there exist a book containing a collection of "formulae" for the use of parish priests in their official correspondence with other parish priests and with diocesan officials?

#### REPLY.

The manuals of Moral Theology and Canon Law usually give a few examples of forms which may be used in applying for various faculties and dispensations. A fuller and more exhaustive collection is found in Mothon: *Institutions Canoniques, à l'usage des Curies Episcopales, du clergé paroissial, et des familles religieuses. Tome III, Formulaire* (Bruges Desclée, De Brouwer and Cie, 1924. 569 pages. 20 fr.). This formulary volume can be bought separately. For those who have some slight knowledge of Italian there are two other works: Fanelli: *Guida del Clero nei Rapporti con la Curia diocesana* (Vicenza, Casa Editrice Pontificia e Vescovile, 1929. 669 pages. 18 lire). A more specialized collection, also in Italian, is provided by d'Angelo, *La Curia Diocesana, Vol. I, Organizzazione; Vol. II, Funzionamento* (Giare (Sicilia) Casa Editrice Dr Pietro Lisi, 1922. 126 and 350 pages. 15 lire each). Each of these works gives the formulae, in nearly every case, in Latin. The work of d'Angelo is designed chiefly for the use of diocesan officials, Fanelli chiefly for the parochial clergy. Mothon's *Formulaire* is of a general character.

E. J. M.

#### THE FORM OF ABSOLUTION.

Before the Code of Canon Law children under fourteen years of age could incur excommunication "in violatione clausurae monialium." Since the Code they cannot incur any censure "latae sententiae." What force, then, in their case have the words: "Dominus noster Jesus Christus te absolvat . . . et tu indiges"? May a priest, who has many children's confessions to hear, omit all the words of absolution preceding the "deinde"?

#### REPLY.

It is true that persons under the age of fourteen are excused from incurring censures *latae sententiae* (Can. 2230). They are not excluded, however, from incurring censures *ferendae sententiae*. "Notetur verò quod impuberes ex praescripto huius canonis excusantur a poenis latae sententiae tantum; hinc possunt incurrere poenas ferendae sententiae. Quapropter si constiterit dolo malo deliquisse, possunt a iudice poenis ligari" (Sole *De Delictis et Poenis*, §121). Therefore, no

matter how rare the occasion might be, there is nothing inherently impossible in the notion of a child censured in this way being granted absolution in the internal forum; the words are included in the form *ad cautelam*. In the vast majority of cases, not only of children but of adults also, the penitent is not under a censure *de facto*, and our correspondent's question can best be answered by discussing the lawfulness of omitting the words, without any special reference to children.

The point is a rubrical one and has no bearing, of course, on the validity of absolution. The general rule concerning the form is contained in Canon 885 "Etsi preces, ab Ecclesia formulæ absolutoriae adjunctæ, ad ipsam absolutionem obtinendam non sint necessariae, nihilominus, nisi justa de causa, ne omittantur." It is the common teaching that the presence of a large number of penitents, especially children, is a just cause for omitting *Misereatur, etc., Indulgentiam, etc.* and *Passio Domini, etc.* It is admitted also that the omission of the words containing the absolution from censures is not a "grave" matter in those cases in which the confessor is morally certain that the penitent is not under a censure. But there is some difference of opinion whether the inclusion of the words binds *sub levi* in these circumstances.

(a) Prümmer teaches that the inclusion of the phrase binds *sub levi* (Theol. Moralis, III, §329) and this view commends itself to me as the correct one. For the Ritual gives a short form in *periculo mortis* and sanctions the omission of *Misereatur, etc., Indulgentiam, etc.* and *Passio Domini, etc.*, "justa de causa"; but no directions are given about further omissions. We are even ordered to say the curious word "deinde," printed now in the typical edition of the *Rituale Romanum* as part of the prayer, not as a rubric. "In Absolutionis forma Sacramenti Poenitentiae quoad verbum *Deinde* nihil est innovandum, quatenus imprimatur rubro caractere; ideoque hoc verbum dici debet" (*Decreta Authentica*, n. 2764 and *Indices*, Vol. V, p. 5). Moreover, the omission of the "censures" part of the form would entail omitting the whole phrase beginning "Dominus Noster Jesus Christus, etc." which is commonly taken as part of the absolution from censures. The net result of such abbreviation would be a form which is substantially equivalent to that which the Ritual directs may be used only in *periculo mortis*. Finally, of what practical use would this shortening be? The priest must give a penitent time to make a short act of contrition. To dismiss him in breathless haste, with a truncated form, would make the reception of the Sacrament even more mechanical than it tends to be already. In short, to borrow the phrase of the Congregation of Rites: "nihil est innovandum."

(b) It has been necessary to enlarge upon the doctrine of Prümmer, as I have done, because an examination of the authors reveals that most of them hold the other view, namely, that the words in question do not bind, even *sub levi*, provided there

are no grounds for suspecting that the penitent may be under a censure. "Omittere absolutionem a censuris, nullum peccatum est, si nulla habetur probabilis suspicio poenitentem esse irretitum aliqua censura" (Cappello, *De Poenitentia*, II, n. 79. Cf. also Noldin, III, §237; Génicot, II, §265). Therefore, if any confessor wishes to do so, he may certainly follow this solution, although the doctrine given under (a) appears to be more correct and more acceptable in every way.

To the objection that the words have no rational meaning, if the penitent is certainly not under a censure, one may answer that the question is one of rubrics and ceremonial, which continue in all Catholic Rites long after the original reason for them has ceased to exist. The words "inquantum tu indiges" save the form from being quite absurd, and the "censures" phrase, even though it is not necessary, stresses the fact that absolution is given only to those in full communion with the Church. Above all, the words "Dominus Noster, etc." are a useful reminder that Christ is the chief minister of the Sacrament.

E. J. M.

#### SUPERSTITION.

Is it lawful for Catholics to have their fortunes told by means of Palmistry or Cards, on the understanding that they are not seriously giving credence to these practices? Similarly, is it quite lawful for them to wear charms and to observe various popular superstitions such as avoiding the number 13? With regard to all such practices, what is to be said about the clergy who tolerate or encourage them at Bazaars?

#### REPLY.

The various kinds of superstition are dealt with by the Moral Theologians under the virtue of religion, and it is a significant thing, as Fr. Slater notes, that periods which have witnessed religious decay have also witnessed a recrudescence of superstitious practices. (*A Manual of Moral Theology*, I, p. 142; *L'Ami*; *Predication*, 1928, p. 195.) It would seem that human beings have a natural tendency to get in touch with the mysterious and the supernatural through sensible and material channels, a human tendency which Christ Our Lord had in mind in instituting the Sacraments of the New Law, and which the Church has in mind in encouraging the use of a great variety of Sacramentals and other external rites. The tendency would run to excess if not restrained by the authority of the Church, and, indeed, non-Catholics, who do not understand the sacramental principle, often regard the many pious practices of the faithful as examples of superstition. This is all the more reason why we should be more intolerant of superstition than we actually are. Fortune-telling (*divinatio*) involves the use of certain means for revealing the occult, which are not naturally fitted for this purpose nor so ordained by God, e.g., the flight

of birds. Charms and the "such-like fooleries" of the Catechism (*vana observantia*) are, in a rather similar manner, the use of wholly disproportionate means for securing good luck or for averting disaster. The two classes are distinct species of superstition, but they agree in this respect: if the means employed are neither natural, nor ordained by God, nor sanctioned by the Church, their efficacy, if any, must be ascribed to some diabolic power. I am far from sanctioning a too ready perception of diabolic influence, for many of the older authors tended to see the devil everywhere, even in practices which have since been explained by natural causes, as in the case of hypnosis or water divining. Therefore, we can leave entirely out of the discussion any practice which is *capable* of a natural explanation, even though the scientific evidence seems rather fragile. "Per se nullam illicitam exerceri divinationem ab iis qui ex vultu, membrorum dispositione, lineis et partibus manus, scripturae notis, temperiem corporis, immo etiam animi propensiones et affectus probabiliter coniciunt" (Vermeersch, *Theol. Moralis*, II, §244); "... si aliqua probabili conjectura effectus *naturali* causae tribui possit, illicitum non esse illud medium sive remedium adhibere, saltem si fiat protestatio contra diabolum" (Lehmkuhl, *Theol. Moralis*, I, n. 357).

Whilst allowing the greatest latitude for every possible natural explanation in many practices, there yet remains a large class of customs which are pure superstition, and the real objection to superstition rests on the assumption that the devil must be in it somewhere. For if the means adopted are naturally insufficient for obtaining the desired effect, the hoped for result must be expected from some malign preternatural influence. It is idle for a person who takes these practices seriously to argue that they are not intending any commerce with evil spirits, for they do so implicitly and it is precisely for this reason that dabbling in Spiritism is condemned. (Cf. S.O., March 30th, 1898; April 27th, 1917. Dignant, *De Virtute Religionis*, §314).

It is grave sin to give credence to any practice, whether of fortune-telling or using charms, which is superstitious in the sense explained. More commonly the sin would be venial rather than mortal, owing to the ignorance and simple-mindedness of the persons concerned. The same may be said of persons who are given to superstitious practices without believing in them very seriously, or who refrain from certain actions (e.g., from walking under a ladder) from a vague kind of fear that there may be something in it, and they do not wish to have any cause for self-reproach. "De illo usu solent theologi benignius respondere, ita ut, secluso scandalo, eum pro mere veniali habeant" (Vermeersch, *op. cit.*, §242; Dignant, *op. cit.*, §314).

Is there any wrong in indulging in these practices, with no belief whatever in their efficacy, but purely as a joke? *Per se* there is no sin, not even venial sin (Dignant, *ibid*), but *per accidens* there can very easily be grave sin. This would arise

whenever scandal, in the strict sense of the word, is caused, or whenever the practices involve co-operation in the sin of others. For example, a fortune-teller may take his art as a huge joke and so may most of the customers; but there is no remedy against some of them taking it very seriously indeed. Watch the countenances of some people having their fortunes told, or waiting their turn, at a booth in a bazaar. One would never suspect that they were having a playful jest. Or is it for a joke that some hotels never have a number 13 on a room? Is the dismay at smashing a mirror or the anxiety on losing a charm merely a misplaced sense of humour? Grave harm is often caused by educated Catholics who countenance these things, even though they themselves do not take them seriously. The ignorant and the feckless take scandal from their example, and non-Catholics are confirmed in their impression that the Catholic religion encourages superstition.

In conclusion, the question concerning bazaars may easily be answered. If there is reason to believe that practices meant as a joke are being taken seriously by some people, the priest should not tolerate them, for they are at least venial sin. If, on the other hand, there appears to be no danger of scandal or co-operation, they may be tolerated for a proportionate reason—in this case, raising money. The priest responsible for the bazaar must, I suppose, be left to form his own conscience on the matter. My own feeling is that we are too easy in conceding the pure playfulness of fortune-telling and the sale of charms at bazaars. If these things are tolerated, probably the best way to minimise the danger is to stress as much as possible the humorous and joking element in them. Thus, amongst many prominent people approving of the charm MAHZEL, W. H. Berry writes: "It is an infallible remedy for walking under ladders, breaking mirrors, opening umbrellas indoors and producing new plays on Fridays." Prümmer's practical conclusion is excellent: "*In praxi opus est magna patientia et prudentia ad fideles deterrendos a vanis observantiis, cum multi iique pii fideles nihil mali in huiusmodi actionibus percipiant. De vanitate igitur talium actionum prudenter instruendi sunt, quin tamen statim dicatur eas esse in se graviter peccaminosas*" (ibid., §515).



## ROMAN DOCUMENTS

BY THE REV. A. BENTLEY, Ph.D., M.A.

### THE FREE EXECUTION OF SACRED MUSIC.

Attempts have been made for some time past, the S.C. of the Council warns us in a recent *Instruction*, to ignore the special character of the sacred music executed in liturgical functions, and to subject it, like other music, to royalty charges on the plea of composer's or publisher's rights. This, besides ill befitting God's house, has provoked not a few disputes and unpleasant incidents.

In future, therefore, wherever such rights are asserted over sacred music executed in churches during liturgical functions, Ordinaries will take care that these same churches admit no modern music *except* the compositions of authors or publishers who declare in writing that the execution of their works is not subject to author's or publisher's rights.

The observance of this rule cannot rob the liturgy of suitable music. Besides gregorian chant and classical polyphony, there are many famous old compositions which may be freely rendered, provided they conform to the requirements of the *Motu Proprio* of Pius X (November 22nd, 1903). Moreover, many of the best modern composers have declared that the execution of their sacred compositions is exempt from all charge.

In the choice of such works Ordinaries will avail themselves of the services of the diocesan Commission of sacred music, instituted in accordance with Pius X's *Motu Proprio*. Where necessary, however, they should consult the Pontifical School of sacred music in Rome for suitable information (S.C. Conc., February 25th, 1932; A.A.S., XXIV, p. 72).

### PATRON SAINTS.

Taking occasion from a petition of the Archconfraternity of Christian Doctrine, supported by the Cardinal Vicar of Rome, the Holy Father has declared SAINT CHARLES BORROMEO and SAINT ROBERT BELLARMINE joint patrons of all sodalities of Christian doctrine throughout the world. Both saints were Cardinals of Holy Roman Church, conspicuous among other opponents of the Reformation through the far-reaching effects of their catechetical labours. To Saint Charles is due the "Catechismus ad Parochos" or Roman Catechism, and the rise of numerous flourishing schools of Christian doctrine. Saint Robert Bellarmine, author of the famous "Controversies," also wrote strictly catechetical works, and among them, at the bidding of Clement VIII, a golden "Catechism" which has

earned the encomiums of Popes and Bishops through three centuries (*Osserv. Rom.*, May 9th, 1932).

#### MARY'S DIVINE MATERNITY.

The Encyclical *Lux veritatis*, issued on Christmas Day, 1931, to crown the recent centenary celebrations, dealt with the three dogmas on which Ephesus throws special light—the one divine Person in Jesus Christ, Mary's divine Maternity, and the supremacy of the Roman Pontiff (A.A.S., XXIII, p. 493; English translation, "Our Lady's Council: Ephesus, A.D. 431," C.T.S., 2d.).

To erect a liturgical monument of the centenary year, the Holy Father extended to the whole world the feast of the divine Maternity of Our Blessed Lady, hitherto relegated to the appendix of the missal among the feasts "pro aliquibus locis." The revised Mass and Office have been prepared by the Pope's command for the same date, October 11th, and are published in the latest *Acta* along with the new Masses and Offices of Saint Robert Bellarmine and Saint Albert the Great (A.A.S., XXIV, p. 151).

Troubled Mexico has recently acclaimed the fourth centenary of the Apparition of Our Lady of Guadalupe, and the national devotion has been linked to the new feast in a grant of indulgences. Catholics all the world over may gain a Plenary Indulgence on the feast of the Maternity of the Blessed Virgin, on the last Sunday after Pentecost, and on December 12th, the date of the Apparition, if, after Confession and Holy Communion, they pray for the Pope's intention before a picture of Our Lady of Guadalupe exposed in a church or public oratory. For other visits, all who are at least contrite, may gain an indulgence of three hundred days once a day, and seven years and seven times forty days on the twelfth of each month (A.A.S., XXIV, p. 129).

#### THE INDEX OF PROHIBITED BOOKS.

On February 20th and April 8th respectively, the Holy Office condemned the following works, and ordered them to be placed on the *Index*:

LEON DAUDET: *Les Bacchantes. Roman contemporain.* Ernest Flammarion, Editeur (A.A.S., XXIV, p. 71).

FELIX SARTIAUX: *Joseph Turmel, prêtre, historien des dogmes.* Paris, Les Editions Rieder (A.A.S., XXIV, p. 145).

The S.C. describes Daudet's book as "ipso iure damnatum . . . librum quam maxime obscenum." A notice of the career and condemnation of Turmel may be found in the *CLERGY REVIEW*, 1931, p. 214.

## BOOK REVIEWS

*Digging Up Biblical History.* Vol. II. By J. Garrow Duncan, B.D. (S.P.C.K. pp. xiii. and 256. 12s. 6d.)

*History of Palestine and Syria.* By A. T. Olmstead. (Scribners. pp. xvii. and 637. 30s.)

These two books may fittingly be reviewed together. Mr. Duncan's book sets out the non-literary material dug up in Palestine. Professor Olmstead interprets that material with the aid of, though not always to the advantage of, the literary material of the Old Testament and records from the neighbouring peoples.

The purpose of both authors is practical. Mr. Duncan adds as sub-title to his book "Recent Archaeology in Palestine and its bearing on the Old Testament Historical Narratives." Professor Olmstead writes in his introduction: "This book has been written not for the professional scholar, but for that wider public which desires to know how the old Sacred Book has become a new Sacred book in the light of the ancient Near Eastern History." What *would* be interesting would be to read a review of the interpretation of the Chicago Professor's History by the British Archaeologist; and still more interesting would be the former's review of the latter's "Accuracy of the Old Testament." Not that these two writers are at opposite poles, but we cannot see them in the same latitude. The Professor recognizes that it is not easy to satisfy each and every student of Old Testament History and Literature: "For many the results may appear too radical, some Biblical scholars will doubtless consider them too conservative." For ourselves, we would hazard the guess that, even among well-intentioned students there is more and more scepticism of "results" now than hitherto and that there is, if not yet here, at least on the way, a rather bored "Very interesting story. You may be right." For that reason, as well as for the growing desire to have more facts and less theory, Mr. Duncan's book will be the more permanent, but not such a quick-seller.

The fact would seem to be that we have come to expect the modern to be wrong about the past. We expect foreigners to be mistaken about England, whether the foreigner be a Siegfried or a Mencken. What of foreigners of A.D. 2000 about the Near East of 2000 B.C.? To say nothing of "the close of the Palæolithic Age 10,000 years ago." It is the whole boast of the present day, with its background of lawns and libraries, that we have said good-bye to all that, and to much that is more recent. And a Catholic has the daily experience of good-minded men making howling mistakes in matters of interpretation of Catholic worship, of the meaning of explicit doctrine, even

when they have been at some pains to learn the facts. It is all so very difficult that we refuse to allow the naïve claim of the modern with his books and his languages to raise the dead to life: not the life of hunting, agriculture and war, but the deeper life of mind and heart, except where evidence in contemporary writing or in trustworthy tradition is abundant enough for at least the main elements. In the matter of Palestinian and Syrian "life," the evidence before the Mosaic period is, we submit, far too scanty, and the further we go back of that age the more scanty the material and the more presumptuous the interpretation.

Thus: "his fear of hostile nature may have led him to suspect some power beyond himself" (p. 8); "during Palæolithic times man had begun to sense a something outside himself. No longer was he helpless in the face of a hostile nature. He might be surrounded by powers which killed or maimed or caused his all too frequent illness or deprived him of sorely needed food; by practices handed down from the fathers the evil could be warded off and the good secured. The most efficacious charms were in possession of the medicine man, whose mystic knowledge might bring him leadership in times of crisis. . . . By magic death . . . the malignant spirit of the dead companion, could be warded off . . . the dead might hope for a happy life in the after world. To us of to-day this is magic of the lowest sort, but it was the beginning of religion. From it were to come the highest forms of religious thought, for in these sensings of a power beyond the individual was a something which was to end in the conception of a God" (p. 15). We feel something of the provocation of the American who is said to have remarked: History is bunk!

Of course it is not. Nor is Professor Olmstead's *History*. He has attempted to do what was much needed: to "place" Palestine and Syria. You cannot understand Syria unless you recall that it was a bridge which led from Egypt to Asia Minor, Assyria, Babylonia and Persia; that over this bridge came armies and traders bringing cultural elements; that the broad elements of Hebrew culture were firmly fixed long centuries before the entrance of the Hebrews into Canaan, elements which the originally nomadic Hebrews assimilated particularly in religion. Before the end of the early historical period, Syria enjoyed a complex civilization: Egyptian, Sumerian, Akkadian and Armenoid elements were fused. In Phœnician Gebal there was a marked Egyptian influence, but also a modification of Egyptian culture by Phœnician (e.g., in the cult of the dead). From towards the end of the third millennium, through the gateway of Carchemish came entirely new customs and technology, etc., etc.

Such is the "thesis" of the *History* and it is bravely put. Much of the evidence of this mingling of cultures is given in Mr. Duncan's volumes of which Volume I was reviewed in THE CLERGY REVIEW of last year. This second volume is concerned

with: Hebrew and Canaanite Architecture, Religion, Inscriptions, Burial Customs, Work in Stone and Metals. Out of such material, Professor Olmstead writes his story under the following tell-tale headings:

In the Beginning; Cave Men, Farmers and Giants; Arab Tribesmen; The Bridge of Assembly; Egyptian Warriors and Canaanite Peasants; Ships of Gebal; Waves from Euphrates and Nile; The Manner of Canaan; Northern Invaders; Egyptian Overlords; Egyptianized Syria; Letters from Syria; Monotheism and its Results; Habiru Invasions; Hebrew Origins; Hittite and Egyptian Masters; Moses and the Southland; Palestine of the Philistines; Yahweh's Wars; Saul, First King of Israel; David's Empire; Solomon in all his Glory; Jeroboam and Israel's Revolt; Repulse of Ashur and of Baal; Reforms of Blood; Interlude; High Lights and Shadows; Assyria's Return; Israel's Fall; Isaiah and Hezekiah; The Rod of Yahweh's Anger; Reaction; Josiah's Reform; Jeremiah the Pessimist; The Fall of Jerusalem; By Babylon's Rivers; Prophets of Hope and of Hate; The First Zionists; The Yoke of the Law; Building the Walls; These from the Land of Sinim; Last Days; Coming Judaism.

Both authors quote the Scriptures. Both give many illustrations of objects found and of places "reconstructed." Those of the History are sumptuous. In both books they are well chosen. It is good to have them alongside the Old Testament text. Thus can one dream the story for oneself. Certainly the debate is no longer about language but archaeology; the arguments are not lexicons but the spade. Or is it philosophy? I suspect that the difference between Mr. Duncan and Professor Olmstead is really a difference about the ruling of the world.

T. F.

*Life of the Venerable Anne of Jesus: Companion of St. Teresa of Avila.* By a Sister of Notre Dame of Namur. (Sands & Co. pp. 327. 12s. 6d.)

The Venerable Anne of Jesus joined St. Teresa in the early days of the foundations (1570) when the Saint was experiencing great difficulties. She was very soon put into positions of responsibility, and she fulfilled the prophecy with which Our Lord recommended her to the Foundress: "You must receive Anne de Lobera because she will be of great help to your foundations." She was a woman of great gifts, both natural and supernatural, and the story of her life is full of the records of the admiration of her contemporaries and of the miraculous favours which she received from God. After St. Teresa's death, Mother Anne of Jesus was chosen by M. de Bérulle to establish the Reform in France and, later, at the invitation of the Infanta Isabella, she established it in Flanders. Her history is essential to the full story of St. Teresa's work. It is told plainly and reverently by a Sister of Notre Dame, and is well worth

attention, not only for the interest of the biography itself, but as a record of the state of religion in France and Flanders at that time.

T. E. F.

*Difficulties*, Being a Correspondence about the Catholic Religion between Ronald Knox and Arnold Lunn. (Eyre & Spottiswoode. 7s 6d.)

The value of this correspondence lies in the lessons of its failure. For failed it has in spite of the ability, earnestness and sincerity of its authors. While Mr. Arnold Lunn has, to quote his own words, "not been able to entangle Fr. Knox in a mating net, and the Roman Bishop has not been forked by the Protestant Knight," neither has the Catholic priest been able to convince the Protestant layman.

Professedly Mr. Lunn set out to convince himself that the Catholic Church was the infallible teacher she claims to be. He failed in his quest, because he went the wrong way about it. The simple, sane, straightforward and successful way would have been to ask: Did Christ set up an infallible teaching Church to last all days? If He did, where is she, and what does she teach? For the doctrine of such a Church must be true of necessity, no matter how mysterious and contrary to our expectations its contents.

Mr. Lunn has not done this. He has made the doctrines, as he thinks he finds them, and the life and activities of the Church, as history manifests them, the crucial test of her infallibility. Forgetting that the Church like her Divine author is both human and divine and that she "has her treasures in earthen vessels," he asks how a Church can be infallible and Christ's representative on earth, if it has a list of bad, licentious and worldly Popes, has instituted the Inquisition, failed to emancipate the slaves, teaches eternal punishment, looks upon the Bible as inspired and unerring, cannot really say to what extent Indulgences are profitable, relies upon a system of Natural Theology which is outworn, contradictory and not consonant with modern thought, etc., etc. Surely to journey along such a road is not to reach safely the "End of Controversy" but to lose oneself in a trackless wild.

To answer all these queries in his share of a book of less than three hundred pages is the hopeless task Fr. Knox faces. We cannot but admire the courage, skill and patient courtesy with which he has attacked the work. In this he has been severely handicapped by the demand on the part of his correspondent to be allowed *carte blanche* as to the nature and extent of the *Difficulties* he may wish to submit, and also by the peculiar system of metaphysics which Mr. Lunn follows. Of what use is it speaking of God's existence as being "outside time" to one who thinks eternity endless time, God Himself limited in power and knowledge, His attributes human qualities



in extenso, and His actions to be judged by human standards? On the other hand, Fr. Knox has the advantage of having lived in both camps, and being thereby thoroughly acquainted with the weapons, defences and modes of warfare of both armies.

Its failure notwithstanding, the book will help Catholic apologists to obtain a clear insight into the modern outlook on things religious and to realize to what "lampless words of doubt" the substitution of "experience" for ecclesiastical authority may and does lead even honest minds. It is our want of such insight and our inability to see things from the modern point of view which causes so much of our apologetic attack to miss fire.

The book has been written on both sides in a spirit one must admire for its courtesy and candour, its facing of difficulties squarely and its avoidance of mutilated quotations, half-truths and misrepresentation so frequently to be found in writers of the ultra-Protestant type.

A. H. VILLIERS.

*Un Franciscain, Théologien du Pouvoir Pontifical au XIV siècle, Alvaro Pelayo, Evêque et Pénitencier de Jean XXII, par Nicolas Jung, Docteur en Théologie. (Vrin, Paris, 1931. pp. 243. 25 francs.)*

"The roots of this greatest of mediæval institutions (the Papacy) . . . are found more in the traditions of imperial Rome than in the religious milieu of Palestine; and its title-deeds are rather the Donation of Constantine and the pseudo-Isidore than the disputed Petrine passages of the Gospels."<sup>1</sup> This statement is the expression of an old theory frequently answered by Catholic historians. The work of Dr. Jung supplies a new and rather surprising answer. Treating of the theology of Alvaro Pelayo he shows that, at the very time when the Popes are supposed to have been consolidating their fictitious claims, one theologian at least based those claims on the Petrine passages. So certain was Pelayo of the import of these passages that he used them not as a means of demonstration of the Papal claims, but rather as a source of immediate inference (cf. p. 103). It will come as a surprise to many Protestants to read (p. 200): "Loin d'être un appui en faveur de la supériorité du pouvoir spirituel, cette donation (la Donation Constantinienne) soulevait de sérieuses difficultés, auxquelles l'auteur crut bon de répondre."

Guided by Dr. Jung's clever analysis the reader soon realizes that Alvaro Pelayo did not make new claims, but merely summed up the teaching of the Fathers and theologians from St. Augustine's time. His work "*De Statu et Planctu Ecclesiae*" is a more explicit statement of the original Catholic tradition concerning the Papacy. The primary purpose of Dr. Jung's book is not apologetic, though, in the opinion of the

<sup>1</sup> *Church and State in England since the Reformation*, by Norman Sykes (Benn).

reviewer, that is its chief value for English readers. In France a work on the History of Dogma, such as this, has an exclusively Catholic public, because the anti-Catholic there, being also anti-Christian, is not interested in the Papal claims. In England, however, we still have to deal with many who desire a non-Papal Christianity, and who would love to prove the claims of the Papacy to be a foreign element in Christian tradition. This book shows, though not of set purpose, the utter futility of such desires.

Actually the real purpose of Dr. Jung is to show the development of the doctrines concerning the Papacy at the hands of a theologian who has been too long neglected by Catholic writers. This task he has fulfilled in an admirable way. With the exception of the first two chapters the book is most readable; the French is simple and the reader is carried almost without effort through the various stages of Pelayo's theology, every statement being supported by an abundance of quotations and references. An especially pleasing feature of this book is the neat summary of the subject-matter at the end of each chapter.

One slight criticism may be made of the author's explanation of Pelayo's plagiarisms (pp. 41-2). The only defence offered is this: "La coutume, couramment admise et pratiquée au Moyen Age, et plus particulièrement à son époque, suffit à l'excuser." Surely a better explanation could be made from the fact (cf. p. 88) that Pelayo was a canonist first and a theologian second. Now the canonist is dependent on past writers much more than the theologian. Taking the law for granted he has to interpret it rather than to prove its validity, and he must base his interpretations on the statements of earlier authorities.

This small defect, however, should not deter students of Church History, of the History of Dogma and of religious controversy from purchasing this extremely useful book.

R. W. MEAGHER.

*Through the East to Rome.* By the Rev. G. J. MacGillivray, M.A. (Burns, Oates & Washbourne. pp. 263. 6s.)

Travel and Theology are unusually combined in this story of a conversion which tells how the experiences of four years among "the separated Churches in the East" led the writer, by the grace of God, to enter the Catholic Church. The rather unexpected route of his path to Rome is more than ample apology for adding to the long list of conversion-stories; in fact, the travel-stuff alone justifies the present volume.

The author's valuable contributions to the CLERGY REVIEW of June and July, 1931, had already stimulated interest in the general position of the present day Nestorians. Here, in addition to a graphic picture of their everyday life, we get much more information about their history, beliefs and traditions. Two important conclusions emerge from Fr. MacGillivray's study: (1) that their actual belief about Our Divine Lord seems

to be perfectly orthodox, their heresy largely consisting in obstinate adherence to the old Nestorian catchwords; (2) that the real cause of their attitude to Rome is to be sought in a sectarian spirit of exaggerated nationalism.

While working in the East as a member of the Archbishop of Canterbury's Assyrian Mission, the author was very soon confronted with the intellectual difficulties of his position. He was not there to teach Anglicanism, nor could he teach Nestorianism. Nothing remained but to teach a vague form of "Catholic Faith" and skate over thin ice in the matter of the Incarnation. In this unsatisfactory state of things, the author inevitably turned his thoughts to the question of dogma and teaching authority; he saved time and trouble by rejecting the impossible idea of a loose federation of national Churches achieving greater unity by admitting greater vagueness, and soon reached the logical conclusion that there must be some central teaching authority, divinely-appointed, permanent and one. At this stage, in Newman's phrase, he "saw the ghost" and for the first time in his life asked himself the question: Can it be that the Roman Church is right after all?

There followed a couple of years of intensive reading while the author, now returned from the East, had charge of a small church in Dundee. After scrupulous examinings and re-examinings of fundamental principles, he saw the impossibility of continuing his ministry in the Anglican Church. He explained things to his bishop, learned to drive a Ford (the War was on), and went with the French Red Cross to Salonika. He could now think over things away from books, and here and there in the Balkans he jotted down on scraps of paper his reasons for joining the Catholic Church. Returning to England, he was received into the Church and after some time went to Rome to study for the priesthood at the Beda College, where he was ordained in 1923.

Searchers for the light will find in this volume valuable guidance and a warning against the danger of baulking at one or two isolated difficulties instead of studying the Catholic position as an ordered whole; students of theology will find familiar arguments set forth in pleasing and convincing fashion; the general reader will find a highly interesting account of life and manners in the East.

BERNARD PATTEN.

*La Lettera di Aristea a Filocrate.* By Raffaele Tramontano, S.J. Ufficio succursale della "Civiltà Cattolica": Naples. pp. xvi., 208\*, 266. Price 50 lire.

It would indeed be difficult to find any matter relevant to his subject that has been overlooked by Father Tramontano in his thorough and masterly examination of *The Letter of Aristea*—the apologetic work of Jewish propaganda that purports to tell the history of the origin of the Septuagint.

Every detail has been submitted to microscopic inspection, with the result that this book may justly be regarded as the classic work on the subject.

The lamentable death of the learned author while his book was in the press is referred to by Father Vaccari, Vice-President of the Biblical Institute, who introduces this "first translation of the *Letter* into Italian directly from the original text" to its readers. The Introduction deals first with the manuscripts and versions; then with the analysis of the *Letter*. A brilliant sketch of the historical background throws new light on hitherto obscurities in the period of the Ptolemies. The author of *Letter* is then considered: he was not a Gentile, as some have thought, but an Alexandrian Jew. He was not contemporaneous with the events he describes, as he pretends to be. His name is a pseudonym. His propaganda is to influence the Greeks in favour of the Jews. On these points. Fr. Tramontano is in accord with the majority of recent writers on the subject. On the question of date he agrees with Schürer (against considerable diversity of opinion) that circa 200 B.C. is most probable, "or, to be more precise, in the last years of Ptolemy IV, Philopator."

Did Aristeas invent the legend of the translation himself, or did it exist before he wrote it down? The author favours an oral story which Aristeas adopted and embellished for his purpose. How far is the work fictitious and how far historical? "One can say that in recent years the much abused Jew has recovered some lost ground" (p. 113\*); and a summary of what is of value is given on p. 122ff. Wurtz's hypothesis of a Septuagint made from a transliterated Hebrew text is sufficiently examined. Further chapters discuss the doctrines of the book, its linguistic peculiarities, and its influence on later writers—Philo, Josephus, Eusebius, Epiphanius (who added the details about the writers being locked up in skylighted cells in pairs, with their servants and shorthand writers!), St. Jerome (who laughed at the tale of the cells), St. Augustine, and others.

In the second part of the book the Greek text faces the Italian translation. Abundant and excellent footnotes are given. In the Appendix Father P. A. Strazzulli, S.J., writes a note on Codex E. and adds references to the Introduction. It is a pity that this invaluable work is without an Index.

T. E. BIRD.

*Das Buch Job* übersetzt und erklärt von P. Paul Szczygiel, M.S.C. Bonn: Peter Hanstein. pp. 258. brosch. M.9.20.

The Bonn commentaries on the Bible, written by the best Catholic scripture scholars in Germany, are making rapid progress. In less than two years we have had Heinisch on *Genesis*, Bévenot on *Machabees*, and now *Job* is translated and explained by P. Paul Szczygiel, M.S.C. This latest work follows the general lines of its predecessors: introduction, followed by a new translation of the text, to which are subjoined critical and exegetical notes.

The introduction is shorter than usual—an advantage, perhaps; for one is not tired of the volume before the first chapter is reached! The treatment is sober and conservative: Job was an historical person, an Arab, not an Israelite: indications in the book suggest that he lived in patriarchial times. But *Job* was written by an Israelite, probably about the time when the Exile was imminent; and he probably adapted the original story. The solution of the great problem with which the book is concerned comes neither from Job himself nor from his "friends," but from the discourse of Elihu (Eliu) combined with the theophany (cc. xxxviii.-xli.); hence the authenticity of these two sections, to which critics have taken strong objection, is calmly considered and established: "without Elihu's speech the Book would be a torso" (p. 25).

The translation is based on the critical text edited by Beer in Kittel's *Biblia Hebraica*, and on Swete's edition of *The Old Testament in Greek*. The text is clearly printed in stanzas. The exegetical notes show that the writer has read all the leading commentaries, Catholic and non-Catholic. On the important passage xix. 25-27 he points out that S. Jerome had exactly the same text as the Massoretes, but that he paraphrased rather than translated. In accordance with the plan of these commentaries Hebrew words are always transliterated. The volume is a valuable addition to Catholic biblical study.

T. E. BIRD.

*EVANGELIORUM* secundum Matthaeum, Marcum & Lucam necnon quarundam partium Joannis *SYNOPSIS* cum Introductione de Quaestione Synoptica et appendice de Harmonia quatuor Evangeliorum auctore A. Camerlynck, S.T.D. & M. Editio 4a, auctior et emendatior. pp. 316. Paper covers 9 Belgas; cloth, 10.50 Belgas.

*PSALMI ET CANTICA* explicata in ordine ad recitationem Breviarii auctore Ach. Vander Heeren, S.T.D. Editio 4a emendata. pp. 528. Paper covers, 8 Belgas; cloth 9.40 Belgas. (Both works published by Charles Beyaert, 8 Rue Notre Dame, Bruges, in the series of *Commentarii Brugenses in S. Scripturam*.)

Each of these well-known helps to a better understanding of the Bible is in its fourth edition; each of them has been in one way or another improved and brought up to date since the third edition was published, though in neither case are the changes very considerable. Canon Camerlynck's *Synopsis*, which was first issued in 1908, shows on a comparison with the first and second editions that both the matter and the format have been much improved in the interval. The long introduction on the Synoptic Problem remains one of the best and fullest that has been published by any Catholic author, but in the successive editions some account has been taken of the large number of works that have been produced in the meantime. It may perhaps be

regretted that in this fourth edition, issued a full ten years after the third (the date at the foot of the last preface should, of course, be 1931, not 1921!) no mention is made of Streeter's book on *The Four Gospels*, of the second edition of Hawkins's *Horae Synopticae*, or, among Catholic writers, of the contributions to the subject by Vosté, Höpfel and others. A reading of Streeter's work would, for example, have lent additional weight to the statement (p. lxxii) "*Nobis visum est probabilia argumenta non dari quibus in hoc Evangelio secundum Marcum varii fontes distinguerentur.*" The actual Synopsis has been altered in certain respects, namely, by the division of the sections into sub-sections, which makes for clearness; by a re-arrangement of the Gospel of the Infancy section, which combines the Matthaean and Lucan matter, instead of printing the two sources separately; and by the inclusion of a good deal of matter from St. John, whereas the third edition did no more than introduce the strictly parallel passages. Perhaps in a future edition Canon Camerlynck will take the final step of printing the whole of the Fourth Gospel. This would no doubt call for some re-arrangement, but it would make the resulting Synopsis even more valuable than it is at present. Special attention should be given to the most useful series of notes on the Vulgate text, though, here again, a more thorough revision would have been a distinct gain.

Canon Vander Heeren's running paraphrase of the Psalms and Canticles was first published in 1913. It was then a larger and bulkier work and was arranged according to the numerical order of the Psalms. Since the second edition of 1916, the valuable introduction has disappeared, though a reprint as a separate volume is promised, the order of the Breviary is followed, and the book is much reduced in size. The only noticeable change in this edition is that the new offices of the Sacred Heart and of Christ the King are referred to in the "Applicationes" that follow each psalm. A somewhat similar work with an English paraphrase was published by Frs. Callan and McHugh in 1929, but it is not so useful for the actual recitation of the office as Vander Heeren's book, since it has not adopted the breviary order of the psalms. Also it is very much dearer. Since the chief difficulty in the way of an intelligent recitation of the Psalter is not the obscurity of the text but the lack of clear divisions, this excellent book with its simple grouping of the various sections will, doubtless, continue to be very popular among the clergy. It should be added, for the sake of those who are so unfortunate as to be without it, that the numerous notes on the Hebrew text and, above all, the continuous paraphrase are an immense help to a fuller understanding of the Church's book of praise.

JOHN M. T. BARTON.



## REVIEW OF REVIEWS

The Fall of Constantinople on Tuesday, May 29th, 1453, is an outstanding event in the history of the world. The last Greek Emperor, Constantine XII, communicated at daybreak in the great Church of Haghia Sophia. It was the last Christian rite celebrated in the great cathedral, and that last Sacrament he received in full communion with the Holy See and with the Catholic Church. He died gloriously defending the Christian cause against the on-coming Turk. A non-Catholic Greek historian, John Cordatos, has recently published a short work on "The Last Days of the Byzantine Empire." A non-Catholic Greek summary of the book by B. Mexas is translated in *L'UNITE DE L'EGLISE*, for April, 1932. Cordatos, basing himself chiefly upon Turkish accounts, holds that the taking of Constantinople was preceded by a positive agreement between the Sultan and the besieged. It is only thus that can be explained why the new Master of the City did not destroy all the churches as would certainly have happened if Constantinople had been taken by assault and not delivered up. Cordatos considers that the person chiefly responsible for the agreement to have been Lukas Notaras, the leader of the anti-union, anti-Latin party; the man who had declared that "it were better that the turban of the Turk should reign in the city than the Latin Tiara." The hatred of the Latin Church was so great that in the last extremity when the anti-union populace was expecting angelic intervention in their favour, "Had an angel really descended from heaven at this moment and brought them word to accept the union, they would not have acknowledged it, and would rather have given themselves up to the Turks than to the Roman Church"—thus the Greek historian Ducas.

There is a change taking place in the political outlook of Catholics in France and there is little doubt that the inspiration of the change comes from England. Cardinal Bourne's declaration that a Catholic might be a member of any of the three political parties provided he never forgot to act on his Catholic principles attracted more attention abroad than over here. Luigi Sturzo in the March *LA VIE INTELLECTUELLE* explained to French readers in the light of his practical knowledge of English conditions, "*Travaillisme et Catholicisme: le problème de la collaboration politique*" (pp. 428-457). He emphasized, of course, the element of illogicality besetting all English politics: if a system works the theories underlying it, or following from it—simply do not exist for the ordinary man. What is practical is preferred to what might theoretically be more excellent.

A few weeks ago appeared a new French daily paper to guide

public opinion in view of the coming election. A modest sheet of four pages L'AUBE (3, rue Garancière, Paris, 6) is written and edited by Catholics but appears as a political not a religious publication. From the beginning it warned French Catholics not to allow the Church to be identified with any political party; not a few of the evils of the past have sprung from the spokesmen of the Right and of the Extreme Right being looked upon as the spokesmen of the Church. In one number the Radical electoral programme was examined, the conclusion drawn was that a Catholic could accept, in fact, in justice ought to accept practically every point of the programme with the one exception of "secularism." "We have more in common with the social ideals of the Radical party than with the reactionary conservatism of the Right, and we ought to be making the influence of our sound social principles felt inside the parties, and not content ourselves with denouncing at every turn men who are striving after noble ideals although we may not agree with all their ideas." LA VIE CATHOLIQUE, of May 19th, vindicates *La nécessaire indépendance de l'église à l'égard des partis*: "Ne soyons donc ni déconcertés, ni découragés (by the result of the election). Méfions-nous des conseils des pessimistes, des surenchères des violents, des regrets stériles des politiciens désavoués par le suffrage universel. Ayons confiance dans la force conquérante de nos idées, et par notre loyalisme civique, la générosité de nos conceptions sociales et internationales, nous imposions à tous le respect des droits de la conscience religieuse."

The May number of LA VIE INTELLECTUELLE opens with a useful analysis of the work of the first year of the Spanish republic *The Secularist Aggression in Spain*. Père Sertillanges writes with appreciation and also with discrimination on *Morale et Religion* d'Après M. Bergson. It is a great book in spite of its omissions and its faults: "Nous n'hésitons pas à dire que par bien des côtés, l'ouvrage que nous analysons est d'un apologiste. Au surplus c'est un poème. A travers un vaste ensemble d'explications mesurées, un grand souffle passe. On s'aperçoit à la fin qu'on vient de voir tracer la courbe de ce *Retour à Dieu* qui fut la préoccupation de nos docteurs, et que c'était donc de Dieu, sans qu'il y parût suffisamment peut-être, qu'on était d'abord parti.

Le style est un enchantement . . .

M. Olivier Leroy, author of *Les hommes Salamandres*, writes a clear analytical note on *The "wonderful" and "primitive thought."* Maurice Brilliant gives us ten pages on *The Philosophy of History and Human Pre-history* suggested by the two first volumes of Herder's great publishing undertaking: *Geschichte der führenden Völker* to be completed in 30 volumes. The opening volumes of this great "History of the Leading Peoples" treat of The Meaning of History by Dr. Bernhart (*Sinn der Geschichte*), and Pre-history of Man by Dr. Obermaier (*Urgeschichte der Menschheit*). History has a meaning, it

is the part a man takes, that a man must take in the coming of the Kingdom of God in time. If that is so, then history has a meaning—which is the glory of God. In the literary section of *Le Vie Intellectuelle*, Père Lagrange, O.P., gives us the guiding lines to reach clear ideas on *The Religion of Goethe*. Alois Stockmann, S.J., one of the outstanding German specialists on Goethe, writes on *L'héritage de Goethe*: "Honorons-le comme l'un des plus puissants créateurs et des plus grands esprits qu'ait connus l'humanité. Mais il n'est pas un docteur de religion, il n'est pas un modèle idéal de la foi allemande et des mœurs chrétiennes, il n'est pas un prophète de la sagesse surnaturelle, et un maître du suprême art de vivre."

The MONTH for May includes Archbishop's Goodier's sketch of *Frédéric Ozanam and his Society*. Father Leeming deals trenchantly with Dr. Brilioth's book on *Eucharistic Faith and Practice* in his article: *Real Presence or Real Absence*: "Dr. Brilioth has courteous expressions for every shade of opinion save the Catholic; a fact which, since he evidently writes with good will and sincere piety, is instructive as showing the radical character of the opposition to the Catholic doctrine of Mass and Real Presence which persists in the followers of the Reformation."

The ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW of Philadelphia opens its May number with a useful summary of the implications of the Instruction of the Sacred Congregation of the Sacraments issued on December 27th, 1930, on the investigation to be conducted before the reception of the Tonsure and Major Orders: *Entering the Priesthood by the Door: Seven Duties of Parish Priests* by Father Nassmann, O.F.M. Father Kaiser writes a strong statistical article on "The Shattered Home." The Rev. Robert J. White, continuing his study of the legal effect of ante-nuptial promises deals with the nature of the right acquired in the ante-nuptial agreement.

EPHIMERIDES THEOLOGICAE LOVANIENSES for April, in addition to its usual remarkable Bibliographical section, gives us a sympathetic appreciation of Louis Billot's theological career by Professor Bittremieux. The articles are: Janssens: *De valore soteriologico resurrectionis Christi*; J. Bittremieux: *L'Institution des sacraments d'après Alexandre d'Hales*; Lottin: *La nature de la conscience morale. Les premières spéculations du moyen-âge*; De Becker: *De canonis 1098 interpretatione*.

E. M.

## CORRESPONDENCE

### PRAYERS AFTER MASS.

Is a priest ever allowed to recite after Mass prayers for some special intention, as prayers for a Novena, *de Profundis* for a deceased member of the parish, or for the Holy Souls during the month of November, etc., apart from such prayers as are prescribed by the Bishop of the diocese?

### REPLY.

In accordance with a decision of August 31st, 1867, public prayers should not be added by the celebrant after the last Gospel without the consent of the Ordinary. This decree lost nothing of its force when Pope Leo XIII in the year 1884 commanded the universal recitation of certain well-known Prayers after Mass. It was reprinted in the *Collectio Authentica* of 1893, and is still held to exclude unauthorized additions to the Leonine prayers. Thus Haegy (*Manuel de Liturgie*, 1922, Tome I, p. 277): "Il appartient seulement au Souverain Pontife ou à l'Ordinaire de prescrire ou d'autoriser ces prières"; Martinucci-Menghini (*Manuale SS. Caeremoniarum*, 1911, I, i, p. 367, n. 4): "Si pium aliquod exercitium, de Ordinarii venia, habendum sit post Missam . . ."; the new Baldeschi (1927, p. 38, note): "Col consenso dell' Ordinario possono aggiungersi altre preci."

A further question, however, is whether the consent of the Ordinary may not occasionally be *presumed*. It is clear that this may happen when the Bishop himself, or a synodal or universal decree, *commends* a particular practice without commanding it. In this way the triple invocation "Most Sacred Heart of Jesus, etc.", recommended by decrees of June 17th and August 19th, 1904, has been universally adopted. Established custom now even imposes it.

The last remark suggests another possible ground for presuming consent, since not infrequently the claim will rest *wholly* on alleged custom. Legitimate customs are notoriously hard to prove. Yet, provided certain conditions are fulfilled, e.g., if the custom commends itself by the analogy of approved practices and does not conflict with the *spirit* behind repressive legislation, if it is long-standing, known and continuously tolerated, there is abundant room for a presumption that the Ordinary approves. It will be sufficient to allude to one instance of such a custom. In Ireland, the Bishops long ago tacitly sanctioned the general practice of saying a *De Profundis* after Mass, and it would now be wrong to disregard it. Conversely, because the custom is not established or recommended in England, its introduction as an inseparable addition to the Mass would be unlawful without the consent of the Ordinary. In the present question,

the strength of a custom lies in the fact that the decree aims at regulating, and not excluding, additions; the weakness of every custom lies in this, that the Ordinary's veto deprives it at once of all legal value.

Again, a certain uniformity should be aimed at even in adopting practices explicitly commended. Since Pope Leo XIII, on February 2nd, 1897, indulgenced the recitation of the "Divine Praises" after Mass and during Benediction, they may be said publicly at either time. Nevertheless, the priest ought now, after thirty-five years, to be guided in his choice by local custom. Custom in this country has retained the invocation "Most Sacred Heart of Jesus" after Mass, and reserved the "Divine Praises" for Benediction. "*Circa hanc invocationem Cor Iesu sacratissimum, aliasque vulgari sermone Dio sia benedetto, melius est ut (sacerdos) loci consuetudinem attendat*" (Martinucci-Menghini, *loc. cit.*).

Another ground for presuming consent may perhaps be found in the transient or trivial nature of a proposed addition. A priest who wishes to add a Hail Mary each morning for some urgent parish want might plead that the matter is too small to worry his Bishop with it, especially since he is establishing no custom to bind his successors. Also an unforeseen emergency may seem to call for a relaxation of the law. When the Ordinary cannot be consulted, his wishes must be inferred from probabilities.

But theories of interpretative permission are easily open to abuse. In many cases, a priest who acts in this way is really setting up precedents to bind future generations as well as himself. And the practices mentioned by our correspondent seem to be open to this objection. They are intended to recur at regular intervals: an annual(?) novena, a *De Profundis* on the death of a parishioner, or daily during the month of November. If these additions are really permanent, it would seem that the express permission of the Ordinary is required.

It remains for us now to give the decree on which these conclusions rest in its historical setting. Previous to the year 1867, there was a tendency among liturgical writers to condemn the recitation of any additional prayers while the celebrant retained the Mass vestments. Hence the attempt, even to-day, to insist on the priest removing at least his manipule before saying the Prayers after Mass. Authors appealed to a decision in *Conversanen.*, dated August 31st, 1669 (S.R.C. 1393). A celebrant bound by the terms of a bequest to recite the Passion according to Saint John after the Gospel *In principio*, was directed to lay aside the Mass vestments, and recite the Passion wearing a cotta, at the altar or in the sacristy. Between the years 1859 and 1864, Bouvry's *Expositio Rubricarum* claimed that the application of the decree could be restricted to prayers which, like the Passion, might appear to be part of the Mass; it need not, he suggested, be extended to cover shorter prayers quite distinct in character from the Mass, such as the *Miserere*,

*De Profundis* or Litany of Loreto. On August 31st, 1867, the S.C. virtually approved this distinction, but added that the Ordinary, and not the individual priest, must be the judge. The question and answer are worded thus: "An possint praecipi, aut saltem permitti, aliquae preces recitandae ad altare post Missam, non depositis sacris vestibus? Obstare videtur decretum in Conversanen. diei 31 Augusti, 1669. R. Affirmative; dummodo preces dicantur assentiente Ordinario" (S.R.C. 3157, ad VII).

The older decree still stands as a finger-post for any who might be tempted to foist private extensions on the liturgy. Otherwise the tolerance of the Holy See is shown by another decree, dated June 23rd, 1893. The Archbishop of Port Louis in Mauritius was assured that he could go on permitting, after Masses at a certain privileged altar, the custom of reciting the *De Profundis*, Acts of Faith, Hope and Charity, an invocation of the Blessed Virgin, and the Prayer for the dead, after the prescribed "Prayers after Mass" (S.R.C. 3805).

We are never allowed to insert anything between the last Gospel and the Leonine prayers (S.R.C. 3682). The latter may occasionally be omitted, but this further enquiry does not concern us here.

A. B.



